

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH: J. M. SHERWOOD.

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTORS:

PROFS. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, J. B. CONDIT, M. W. JACOBUS,
W. M. BLACKBURN, TAYLER LEWIS, G. W. T. SHEDD, H. NELSON,
PHILIP SCHAFF, E. H. GILLET; AND DRS. R. W. PATTER-
SON, WM. ADAMS, AND G. L. PRENTISS.

JANUARY, 1871.



NEW YORK:

J. M. SHERWOOD, 26 BIBLE HOUSE.

(ENTRANCE ON ASTOR PLACE.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOK STORE, 1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: NEW ENGLAND NEWS CO.

AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY General Agents.

TERMS:--\$3.00 in advance; otherwise \$3.50. Single numbers 75 cents.

AGENTS WANTED.

SUBSCRIBERS WANTED

FOR THE

CHRISTIAN AT WORK.

WEEKLY, \$2; MONTHLY, 75 Cts.

EDITORIAL CORPS.

REV. STEPHEN H. TYNG, Jr., *Editor in Chief.*
 REV. W. I. BUDINGTON, D.D. *Congregational.*
 REV. T. W. CHAMBERS, D.D., *Reformed.*
 REV. JOSEPH T. DURYEA, D.D., *Presbyterian.*

REV. CYRUS D. FOSS, *Methodist.*
 REV. WAYLAND HOYT, *Baptist.*
 REV. W. A. MUHLENBERG, D.D., *Episcopal.*
 REV. A. C. WEDEKIND, D.D., *Lutheran.*

The Circulation of our Monthly Edition probably exceeds that of any other Large Religious Journal

IN THE WORLD!

IN OUR

WEEKLY EDITION,

We shall seek to maintain the Characteristics which have hitherto marked our Journal:

AGGRESSIVE.

It will continue to be the Earnest Exponent of Aggressive Christianity; the organ of Missionary, Reformatory, and Benevolent Institutions; the staunch friend of Young Men's Christian Associations; and the advocate of Sunday-Schools and Temperance.

CATHOLIC.

Thoroughly Evangelical, it recognizes the Practical Unity of the Church, and will carefully exclude everything narrow or sectarian.

PRACTICAL.

It will aim not so much to advance NEW THEORIES of Christian labor, as to DESCRIBE THOSE PLANS which in this or other lands have PROVED SUCCESSFUL. It will urge the Church to attempt the work lying all around it, rather than dream of that which it cannot reach.

CHRISTIAN.

Having no SECULAR or POLITICAL Department, it will furnish what has been so long desired, a PURELY RELIGIOUS WEEKLY JOURNAL.

TERMS:

MONTHLY EDITION.

Payable in Advance.

Single Copy, per year, 75 cts	25 Copies, each, per year, 60 cts.
5 Copies, each, " 70 "	50 Copies, each, " 55 "
10 Copies, each, " 65 "	100 Copies, each, " 50 "

New York City and Canada Subscribers should remit twelve cents additional for postage.

(A slight advance has been made in price, as since the last increase in size of the paper, the rate by the 100 copies has been less than cost.)

WEEKLY EDITION.

Payable in Advance.

Single Copy, per year,	\$2 00
10 Copies, each, per year,	1 85
25 Copies, each, "	1 75
50 Copies, each, "	1 60
100 Copies, each, "	1 50

New York and Canada Subscribers should remit twenty cents additional for postage.

SEND FOR SPECIMEN COPIES.

AGENTS WANTED! Clergymen, Postmasters, Members of Young Men's Christian Associations and Sunday-Schools, and all those of either sex who desire to aid the cause of Christian work, are wanted as *Canvassers*.

Those who will engage in an earnest General Canvass, may remit single subscriptions to the Weekly at \$1.50 per year, to the Monthly at 50 cents per year, retaining the excess of cash received as commission.

Those who obtain 100 Subscribers for either, or for both combined, are entitled to an additional commission of twenty-five cents on the weekly and ten cents on the Monthly; this last payable in any of our Splendid Premiums. Those who wish to have their entire commission in these premiums will receive terms on application.

Address,

H. W. ADAMS, 27 Beekman St., New York.



The American Presbyterian Review.

CONTENTS OF THE JANUARY NUMBER.

	PAGE.
ART. I.—THE ANCIENT ORACLES, OR THE PRIMITIVE GREEK RELIGION.....	5
By Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., Union College, N. Y.	
II.—THE SPHERE OF CIVIL LAW IN SOCIAL REFORM....	40
By Prof. JOHN BASCOM, Williams College.	
III.—THE "SOCIAL CONTRACT," AND MAINE'S ANCIENT LAW.....	52
By E. H. GILLET, D.D., Prof. in the University of the City of New York.	
IV.—CALVINISM IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.....	70
By WILLIAM BLACKBURN, D.D., Prof. in Northwestern Seminary.	
V.—THE ORDER OF SALVATION.....	96
By DIAKONUS SHRODER.	
Translated by Rev G. W. SHELDON, Instructor in Union Theolog. Sem.	
VI.—"HOPKINSIANISM BEFORE HOPKINS".....	110
(Supplement to article in the October number.)	
VII.—THE DEAD SEA.....	118
From the <i>British and Foreign Evangelical Review</i> for Oct., 1870.	
VIII.—MINISTERIAL RELIEF.....	128
IX.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.....	169
THEOLOGY; Gess' Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ	
—Thompson's Theology of Christ from his own Words—	
Broadus on Preparation and Delivery of Sermons—Hunt's	
History of Religious Thought in England—Pressensé,	
Early Years of Christianity.....	
BIBLICAL LITERATURE: Quarterly Statement of the Pales-	
tine Exploration Fund—Lightfoot on Galatians—Bleek's	
Introduction to the New Testament—Smith's Dictionary	
of the Bible—Plummer on Romans.....	
CHURCH HISTORY: Presbyterian Reunion, Memorial Volume	
—Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century—	
Pond's History of the Church—Gillett's Life and Times	
of John Huss—Anderson's History of the Sandwich Is-	
lands Mission.....	
PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY: Everett's Science of Thought—	
Murray's Outline of Hamilton's Philosophy—Upham's	
Mental Philosophy—Mommson's History of Rome.....	

323

1458

PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE: Hunt's Bible Notes for Daily Readings—Henry Ward Beecher's Morning and Evening Exercises—Hanna's Life of Christ—Bonar's Life of Milne—Do. Bible Thoughts and Themes—Stevenson's Lives and Deeds Worth Knowing—Miss Warner's What She Could—The Young Ladies Guide.....	181
GENERAL LITERATURE: Hartt on Geology and Physical Geography of Brazil—White's Words and their Uses—Library of Wonders—Dr. Arnold's Life—My Summer in a Garden—Juno Stories.....	182
ART. X.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE....	184
GERMANY.....	184
FRANCE.....	185

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

The *Office* of the REVIEW is removed from 654 Broadway to 26 *Bible House*, to which address please send all communications.

TERMS:—The price is *reduced* to \$3 a year, in advance; when not paid in advance, \$3.50. To Missionaries, Students, and Young Men's Christian Associations, \$2.50 in advance. Single numbers, seventy-five cents.

COVERS:—For *fifty cents* each, covers in heavy black morocco cloth, will be sent, post-paid—neat and substantial. Numbers exchanged for "library" style of binding, \$1 a volume. Back numbers and bound volumes for sale at a low rate.

Lange's Commentary and the Review.

To give an opportunity to any person, *not a subscriber* to the REVIEW, to make its acquaintance, we will give either volume of this learned and invaluable Commentary, and the REVIEW complete for 1871, for \$5, the price of the former; *so that the Review will cost nothing*. Where Lange is sent *at our expense*, 50 cents additional will be required.

To any Home Missionary or Pastor, whose salary does not exceed \$700, we will send the REVIEW complete for 1871, and also for 1869—one of the most valuable volumes in the series, containing over 800 pages—for the nominal sum of \$2.50. For this money more valuable reading, bearing on the work of the ministry, can be had, than \$10 would buy in the ordinary book form. Or for \$1 the volume of 1869 will be sent separately. These offers are restricted to new subscribers.

Address,

J. M. SHERWOOD,
26 Bible House, New York.

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
JANUARY, 1871.

THIRD SERIES.—NUMBER 9.

ART. I.—THE ANCIENT ORACLES, OR THE PRIMITIVE
GREEK RELIGION.

By Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., Union College, N. Y.

ONE OF the most interesting tracts of Cicero is entitled *De Divinatione*.* The skillful and profound argumentation there employed by the character who defends the affirmative is enough to convince any thoughtful reader that, whatever may be its absolute ground of truth, the belief in some mode or art of presaging lies deep in our human nature. The feeling, true or false, is justly treated as one of the fundamental differences between man and the brutes. It is a question whether the latter have any idea of a future at all. There may be in their sensorium a faint image of something coming, a shadowy projection of the present, even as Hamilton defines human memory to be a present feeling of the yet lingering past; but this is far from that notion of future being which makes it a subject of thought or calculation, and still farther from any hope or purpose of discovering the

* It is a kind of supplement to Cicero's greater work, *De Natura Deorum*, and consists of two books. This, and another treatise, *De Fato*, closely connected with it, show a wonderful acuteness on the part of the Roman philosopher and statesman. The ideas of causation, certainty, contingency, identity etc., are discussed with a sharpness of reasoning, and even a theological comprehensiveness, we may say, unsurpassed by Butler, Paley, or Edwards.

secrets it may conceal. With man such a passion has ever been strong. Ages of baffled inquiry have been unable wholly to suppress it. In weakening it, however, two causes have had influence: that more enlarged experience which we call science has shown the fallibility of methods employed; Christianity has repressed the strong desire, by disposing to contentment with that general revelation of the divine will which is given to us in Nature, in History, and the Scriptures.

In the ancient world the hope was vivid, the belief universal. Though *unscientific* it was not *irrational*. There are acknowledged exercises of the soul that *a priori*, or in themselves, are as mysterious as this would be. Sensation, the only source of all knowledge, as some maintain, belongs solely to the present. We can feel only in the present. How, then, should it give us the past any more than the future? Experience is only repetition; how can it give us a knowledge, or an idea, that is no more in the second than it was in the first term of the series. The words "habit" and "association" are convenient, but they utterly fail to reveal to us the links of such association, or that innate connecting knowledge which *accompanies* the sense experience, though strictly forming no part of it. In a word, how do we get that thought of present, past and future, or that idea of time which seems waked up by the sensation, as though it had been there before all experience, or belonged to the original birth-furniture of the soul? It was this that led Augustine to exclaim: "O the mystery of memory!" Instead of being the creator it is the offspring of these elder-born ideas of time and relation, without which memory could have no existence. In the animal there is something that may be called association, a present feeling of a still lingering past. A condition of the sensorium produced by an old danger arouses fear when the cause is again before the eye, but there is no idea of time or causality. In man there is strictly memory, an identifying consciousness, something more than a mere conception or imaging, a certain knowledge of a *personal* existence as something that has been, is now, and is ever passing into the future, or as a future into which we are ever passing. Why might not the coming state, too, have its

signs, its slumbering ideas, its waking vaticinations? It was the same question, whether asked by the philosophic reason, or by that strong human desire which stood in the place of reasoning. We may say the same, too, in relation to the attempted methods of verifying this thought, or of satisfying this feeling: They may have been *unscientific* but they were not *irrational*. Cicero even claims for them a mode of proof which was not unlike that Baconian induction about which there is now kept up such an everlasting din. These methods presented everywhere a strong resemblance. They formed a system that had its rules and processes. It took to itself the name of a science. So Prometheus calls it in that wondrous drama of Æschylus, in which he figures as the benefactor of mankind. It was one of the earliest branches of knowledge reduced to method by the Great Civilizer, as we give it in a free, yet faithful, version of *Prom. Vinc.* 484:

"The various modes of the divining art
 I first revealed;—the dream, its waking issue,
 And omens hard to be interpreted;
 The way-side symbols, flight of taloned birds
 I clearly taught,—all those propitious deemed,
 And those of dire portent,—their several ways,
 Their enmities and loves. The very depths of life,
 The omens in the victims' hidden parts,
 Their smoothness, color,—how they all make known
 The will of Heaven, favoring or adverse.
 The flamed-faced signals of the sacrifice,
 The wondrous forms that from the altar rose;
 How in their parti-colored fires there shone
 A surer light than that to sense revealed;—
 All this to scientific rules I brought.
 Then to the mines, the treasures deeply hid
 Beneath the earth, I showed the way."

We smile at the thought of its being called a science, but such it truly was, if rules, and classifications, and strict definitions, and *regular inductions*, entitle to the name.* Rome,

*Cic. *De Div.* I, 25: Est enim ab omni æternitate repetita, in qua quum pæne innumerabiliter res eodem modo evenirent. iisdem signis antegressis *ars est effecta*, eadem sæpe animadvertendo ac notando . . . 126: Ita fit ut observatione notari possit quæ res quamque causam consequatur. This seems good

as is well known, had its divining College, with its professors, its regulated ceremonies, its strict traditional observances, dating away back to that most religious king, Numa Pompilius. It was known and practiced as an art by the most ancient Ægyptians; it formed an important part of their boasted wisdom; Joseph is not censured as impious or profane in the use he professes to make of it. So we learn from the Scriptures. It differed in its methods from those of Greece and Rome—oneirology, or dream-interpreting, holding a principal place—but it arose from the same strong desire, the same psychological ideas, and, when reverent in its attempt to learn the unknown, does not seem to have been condemned by the sacred historian.

It was called *Divination* from the idea of its having a divine sanction, or as coming from the benevolence of the Deity, according to the argument which Cicero puts into the mouth of his brother Quintus (*De Divinatione*, Lib. I, 82): "The Gods love us, they are beneficent, they understand the nature and constitution of things, they know that we are interested in this knowledge, and that we will be more careful and reverent from having some of it imparted to us."*

Chief among the ways of obtaining divine communications, were oracles, omens, inspection of sacrifices, the flight of birds, and a peculiar class of seemingly casual occurrences—*ἐνόδιοι τε σύμβολοι*, or "way-side symbols," as

Baconianism, and in perfect harmony with the fundamental idea of the Positive School, that there is nothing in the universe but sequences. Again, Sec. 127: *Qui etsi causas ipsas non cernant, signa tamen causarum et notas cernant, ad quas exhibita memoria et diligentia, efficitur ea divinatio quæ artificiosa dicitur.* It need only be kept in mind that the ancient writers often use the word art (*ars* or *τέχνη*) where we would say science, or scientific.

*The argument of the speaker Quintus here is, that a belief in the existence of divine beings is closely connected with a belief in some kind of divination. If there are deities they would not leave us in such total ignorance of things we so long to know, and have such a deep interest in knowing: "Si sunt dei, neque ante declarant hominibus quæ futura sunt, aut non diligunt homines, aut quid eventurum sit ignorant, aut existimant nihil interesse hominum." But they do take an interest in men, he argues; and so he sums up his reasoning (which is the same with that of Chrysippus) in the concise conclusion: "Sunt autem Dei; significant ergo." It certainly is an admirable argument for a revelation generally, even though it may fall in respect to the kinds of divination to which it is here applied. Heaven loves us, and can not, therefore, regard with indifference our profound ignorance of the highest things connected with the human destiny.

Prometheus calls them. Of most of these it might be said, as before, that they were not irrational ; that is, a reasoning being, in the then state of his fact-knowledge, had no reason to be ashamed of such a feeling or such a belief. The idea that that optical appearance called the sky, or firmament, separated us from a more glorious world above, and not greatly distant, may now be called ignorance, but it was not contrary to reason. This is a distinction which becomes of highest importance in judging of opinions different from our own, most remote from us, and, especially, most ancient. Such a view of the nearness, and even accessibility of the superterrene world was, in fact, in that early day, a strict Baconian inference. They followed the teachings of sense, the only guide to knowledge recognized by the Positive School. Above the earth there dwelt the Omniscient One, not far from us in space, as he is not far from us in his all-pervading providence and love. The progressive throwing back, or opening up of the celestial orbs, the "Heavens," and "Heaven of Heavens," of the Jews, the "spheres" of the Greeks, the immeasurable recedings, higher, higher—wider, wider, as revealed by our modern telescopes, have changed the mode of *conceiving*, but have in no respect affected the *idea*. In all this expanding of science there still remains the thought of the Great Heaven, the symbolical contrast to earth. We can trace the ever rising, ever unfolding view. There is first the optical sky. As knowledge lifts up the "everlasting gates," this expands into the astronomical or telescopic heavens ; but there is still beyond and above all these, that heaven of which the Psalmist speaks—*so high* that "He stoopeth down to behold the things that are in *heaven* (the lower heavens) as well as those that be on earth,"—the Third Heaven which is over all, surrounding all, embracing all, the spiritual empyrean that piety regards as the abode of Him "who inhabits eternity"—

So near and yet so far!

inconceivably distant, it may be, in space, yet that distance disappearing to the rational contemplation even of the fi-

nite soul.* But while the *idea* is thus unchangeable, the representing *conception* is ever dependent upon the sense, whether it be the naked seeing, or the imagination aided by the suggestions of scientific discovery. Astronomy has not helped us here. It has given La Place no advantage over David and Pythagoras. The earliest belief in Deity was as pure, as holy, as rational, as any that has followed it.

And so, too, was the thought of Revelation. There surely must be some communication between the finite and the infinite mind; this thought the human soul never has, it never will, it never can give up. The outward diagram that expressed it to the earliest thinking was exceedingly simple. Above the near sky sat the Elohim, so called, as God of Gods, or as thought of in his unapproachable unity, the El Shaddai (the Almighty), El Elion (the Most High), El Olam, the One Eternal, Πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, the Everlasting Father, with his attendant hosts of mighty though inferior powers. The lofty flight of birds suggested the idea of possible intercourse with this apparently inaccessible upper world. Indications, it was supposed, might be thence received, of which these favored soaring messengers might be the appointed media. It was the same feeling which brought out the idea of worship on the "high places," or of scaling the lofty mountain in hopes of reaching the place where the earth seemed to rise up to heaven, or heaven to come down to earth. The latter idea was the earliest abandoned, or remained only as a sublime memorial of adoration. The bird divination continued much longer. It was not absurd, however small the knowledge in which it had its conceptual origin, or however strange and inconsistent some of the methods through which the attempt was made to realize it.

* The other and worse extreme is the one to which the mind may now be tending. In our philosophic and scientific pride we are in danger of dwelling too much on the far-off aspect, losing sight of the intimate and the near, and undervaluing or rejecting as inconsistent what the Scriptures plainly teach of God as the universal numen, and, at the same time, a patril deity, α θεός πατριῶτος, or "God of his people." To correct the perversion of the latter aspect, or too much narrowing of the former, God is represented as saying, by the prophet, Jer. xxiii, 23, 24: "Am I God at hand, and not God afar off? Do I not fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord." The two extremes meet, Isaiah lvii, 15: "Inhabiting eternity, dwelling on high, and holy (that is separate, apart), yet also with the lowly and contrite in spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble."

And so may we hold in regard to sacrifice. This has a Scriptural foundation. It became afterwards everywhere perverted from its primitive typical meaning as a symbol of reconciliation, but it ever remained as an attestation of some possible divine intercourse. It was the offering of *life*, that awfully mysterious thing which still so baffles the keenest researches of our science. In some way, however dark, it represented the *life's* devotion of him who laid it upon the burning altar. The victim was a messenger of this sent to the invisible world. The belief in sacrifice as a propitiation, or a sign of propitiation, very naturally connected itself with the thought that the more interior parts of the animal offered, or those in which this life was supposed to be most deeply enshrined, might present some indication of its acceptableness or rejection.

The same feeling prevailed in respect to the oracles. If the will of Heaven could be ascertained at all, it was reasonable to suppose that there might be found some physical indications of it in the strange sights or sounds presented in certain mysterious and awe-inspiring regions of the earth. Thus the *Religio loci* became a prominent feature of the ancient divination. This, too, had a sacred origin; the feeling is attested, and, in some measure, sanctioned by Scripture: "Surely the Lord is here," said Jacob, Gen. xxviii, 15, "and I knew it not; and he was afraid and said *Ma nora hamma-gom hazzé*, How fearful is this place? it is none other than the house of God, the very gate of Heaven." It was a similar feeling when the weird aspect of the desert, combined with the supernatural flame of the burning yet unconsumed bush, called forth from the shepherd Moses the exclamation: "I will turn aside now and see this great sight" (Ex. iii, 3). Even before the vision of the burning bush this wild volcanic region had been regarded as having a sacred character. This is intimated in the fifth verse: "Come not too near, take off thy shoes from thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." The old *religio loci* is also to be inferred from the fact that this region was held to be oracular by the Arabians before the time of Mohammed. A similar impression may have been produced by the awe-in-

spiring aspect of the place that marked the future site of Rome, and which, ages before, was regarded as prophetic of its fearful greatness. There is language in the Prophet Daniel, x, 13, 20, which intimates that, in the divine scheme of the spiritual invisible world, great powers in history, such as Persia and Javan (or Greece), have had their "*princes*" or tutelar directors. So the *Genius Romæ*, the fourth great coming "Kingdom" of which Daniel dreamed, may have made its presence early felt in the strange locality from which such a mighty world-power was afterwards to go forth. The imagination of Virgil (*Æneid*, viii, 348) could not have so vividly called it up had there not been some old tradition that guided the backward vision of the Seer from the "golden" days of Augustus to centuries before Romulus was born :

"Aurea nunc, olim sylvestris horrida dumis.

Jam tum RELIGIO pavidos terrebat agrestes

Dira loci; jam tum sylvam saxumque tremebant.

Hoc nemus, hunc, inquit, frondoso vertice collem,

[Quis Deus incertum est] habitat Deus. Arcades ipsum

Creduunt se vidisse Jovem, cum sæpe nigrantem

Ægida concuteret dextra, nimbosque cieret."

"All golden now, then rough with thickets wild.

Even then the awful Genius of the place

The rustics awed. They trembled when they saw

The wood, the rock. Within this grove, he said,

Upon this hill, its top with forests crowned,

Some god did dwell; what god it was unknown.

The Arcades believe that Jove himself

They've seen, as often, with his own right hand,

He shakes the ægis darkening all the air,

And summons forth the murky thunder clouds."*

*We have endeavored to give a verse translation of this most striking passage, as literal as possible, and yet preserving, to a good extent we think, its wonderful power and vividness. It is not easy to give concisely, or by any single epithet, the majestic gloom, the terrific sublimity, of that word *nigrantem* as applied to the Ægis, or Jove's dark-flashing shield,—the waving, lurid blackness of the swiftly rising *nimbus* or thunder-cloud. We take *nigrantem* in the active transitive sense, of which it is capable. The object left out increases the power of the image: throwing a black and seemingly tremulous shadow upon the air. Compare the words *media nimborum in nocte*, Georgic. II, 328. Compare also Ps. lxxxii, 8: "In the

Who shall say that such tradition of a mysterious local influence may not have had some foundation in fact? What science is there that warrants, much less compels, denial, as of something absurd or impossible. There is a "groaning and travailing" in the physical world, as though it had some instinctive intelligence of the *greater world it represents*. We have high authority for this: "And there shall be earthquakes in places, and terrors, and great signs,—and upon earth pressure of nations in distress, the sea and waves roaring." It is an old belief, and one not yet refuted, that nature sympathizes with humanity in its great movements, in its great crimes, and its great miseries,—or that behind the curtain of nature there may stand mighty spiritual agencies giving forth, through this travailing voice, premonitions of powers and events that are to have a controlling influence in the world's history.

The distinction, however, which we have made, is a valid one. All this belief in divining powers and places might be very *unscientific*, as judged by our present knowledge and present notions; but it was not *irrational*. The Scriptures show us that God has, in some measure, condescended to these strong human feelings, and has, at times, himself undertaken their guidance. He established oracles, or oracular symbols, and oracular places, for his chosen people. He gave them signs in Egypt, signs in the wilderness, signs local as well as preternatural. In the later writings these are mentioned as evidences of his beneficence; as in Ps. lxxviii, 43; cv, 27; cxxxv, 9. In their bondage it was revealed that "they were to worship God in a certain mountain;" and this religion of sacred shrines and symbols was to continue, in some form, through their national history,—or "until Shiloh came, to whom there was to be the gathering of the peoples," as to the great and final oracle before whose sun-like presence all others' should disappear as paling stars whose beams

The new enlightened world no more should need.

secret place of the thunder;" Ps. xcvi, 2: "Clouds and darkness are round about him;" Ps. xcvi, 10: "And darkness (the *araphel*, or blackness of the thunder cloud) was beneath his feet."

It is an unmistakable feature of the earlier Jewish history, this inspired reverence for sacred localities, such as Mizpah, Bethel, etc., where the people came "to inquire of the Lord," before the building of the temple and the full prophetic era. So, too, some kinds of divination practised among the surrounding nations are clearly alluded to. They are not charged as groundless imposture, though by no means approved as reverent, or true in the highest sense. The Egyptian *Magi*, the Chaldean *Haruspices*, are not spoken of as conscious cheats, though baffled by a diviner art. The heathen Balaam is presented as a true prophet, with a real unearthly afflatus. Although an evil man, he was permitted to see the star rising out of Jacob, and the scepter proceeding from Israel,—the far-off glory of the latter day.

Aside, however, from their actual credibility, or their theoretical rationality, the ancient oracles present to us a subject of deep and curious interest. Their long dominion over the human mind, the influence they have had in the course of human events, give them a strong claim to our study. They were very ancient. They belong to the very earliest migrations of the race. The language used by Cain, Gen. iv, 14, shows the feeling men had in leaving the old homeland, notwithstanding the new migratory impulse which had taken possession of them since the supernatural events at Babel. They were driven forth into the "wide, wide world," then all unknown, and full of all imagined dangers. Into boundless space they went, across the arid desert, or through the dense and pathless wilds, or venturing upon the stormy seas. Impious as they had shown themselves, yet, in view of the old associations, it was like "going out from the presence of the Lord," from the land and sky where dwelt the ancestral Deity. Hence the mind was ever intent upon methods by which, as was supposed, they might carry something of that presence with them. Thus it was that in the Mediterranean stream of migration, oracles, "mysteries" (*teletai*, or secret rites connected with some supposed mysterious knowledge), were among the first things that show themselves in the very dawning of history.

The oracle of Dodona belongs to this early mythical period.

It must have been of Pelasgian, that is, of Javanic origin, and its great antiquity running far up into the ante-Homeric times, furnishes no slight proof that in this name there is preserved the Dodan, or Dodanim, of Gen. x, 4: "And the sons of Javan (Ion) were Elisha (Hellas), and Tarshish, and Kittim (Macedonia), and Dodanim." The last has a plural termination, but, like others in this genealogical table, is representative of one who was the founder of a race, clan, or settlement, named after him. It may be noted here that Javan, Yawan (Iwan, Ion) has ever been the name by which Greece was known to the Shemitic nations, although the Arabians, in later times, called it Roum from the second or Græco-Roman Empire. As authority for regarding Kittim as Macedonia, see 1 Maccabees i, 1, and viii, 5. By almost universal consent, Tirash is held to be synonymous with Thrace. The mythical Greek accounts of Ion, Hellas, Dorus, Æolus, etc., are a confounding of chronologies and genealogies, a contradictory mingling of the Javanic and Pelasgian with later periods.

The Dodanim settled Dodona, Western Greece, called afterward Epirus, or the Continent, the mainland, as distinguished from the Western or Ionian isles that lay near it. For Elisha and Kittim, see also Ezek. xxvii, 6. Tarshish, or the sons of Tarshish, went farther on, and made the beginning of settlements in Spain, or near the Pillars of Hercules (Ezek. xxvii, 12). Hence it became a name for any distant land, and "ships of Tarshish" meant ships that went very long voyages, such as Phœnician sailors and traders made in very early times, even to the Atlantic, and far into it, north and south. So those that Solomon and Hiram sent were called "ships of Tarshish," though sailing in a different direction. It was very much as we now speak, or used to speak a few years ago, before Suez Canals and Pacific Railroads, of China ships and East Indiamen. There are some grounds, too, for supposing that, in early times, there was the idea of an Eastern Tarshish as well as a Western; just as now we use the names East and West Indies. The thought of the earth's sphericity, and of the remote East and West being very near to each other, is not wholly modern. Aris-

totle was very familiar with it, and besides giving a very clear and cogent argument, containing most of the positions popularly presented in our school-books,—such as the elevation or depression of stars, phenomena of sailing vessels, etc.,—he speaks of a belief prevailing that the Pillars of Hercules were not far from India (see Aristotle, *De Cælo*, Lib. II, Sec. xiv, 15). As held by the Tyrian sailors, who were acquainted with both regions thus called Tarshish from their similar remoteness, it may have been an early belief, which become still more current in Aristotle's day. We have elsewhere given the *phenomenal* evidences of the earth's roundness, as they must have struck thoughtful observers in the earliest times. *Ancient Astronomy*, Bib. Rep. 1849.

"By these," continues the account in Genesis (x, 5), "were divided the isles of the nations, each according to their families" (tribes or clans). Hence that frequent scriptural name, ISLES. It was used for all the Western Mediterranean country; because Greece, Italy, Spain, with their numerous bays, peninsulas, and indented coasts, presented that appearance to the early Tyrian voyagers, as well as the islands proper, such as Cyprus, Crete, Eubœa, with the numerous Cyclades, etc. It was figured to the early imagination very much as the Northern portion of the American continent now appears in those imperfect maps which leave blanks in the continuity of coasts. The Mediterranean regions became, doubtless, better known afterwards; but the early impression had given the geographical name, which was still retained. Hence arose a division of the known world, generally, into two great parts: The Earth (*aretz*), that is, the land or mainland, the Continent, on the one hand, and the Isles of the Sea on the other. It is not found in Homer, or in any early Greek writing, because it would necessarily be a view peculiar to the Asiatics, as presenting itself from their standpoint. There is a good example of it in the language used, Esther x, 1, setting forth the Persian Edict: "King Ahasuerus" (Xerxes), it is said, "laid a tribute upon the earth (the land or mainland) and upon the Isles of the Sea." It was the Persian as well as the Hebrew manner of speaking, and, in the swelling style of the Oriental monarch, was

regarded as including the whole *oikoumené*, or *habitable world*, as the Roman Empire came afterwards in like manner to be called. This ancient dual division of the world is most clearly and sublimely expressed, Ps. xcvii, 1,

Jehovah reigns ; let *Earth* rejoice,
Let the *many Isles* be glad.

The dual idea is also well exemplified in other passages, such as Isaiah xli, 5: "The Isles saw and were afraid; the ends of the earth (the remote countries of the Asiatic continent, such as the land of Sinim, or China) were in terror;" Isaiah xlii, 4: "Until he set judgment in the *Earth*, and the *Isles* shall wait for his law." Compare also Isaiah lxvi, 9: "For the Isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish to bring thy sons from afar;" Isaiah xl, 15: "He taketh up the isles (the vast unknown Western regions) as a *mite* (*dak*) or very little thing;" Ps. lxii, 11: Tarshish and the Isles; Zeph. ii, 11 (the same comparison as in Ps. xcvii, 1, Isaiah xlii, 4): "He shall make lean all the gods of the *Earth* and there shall bow down to him all the *Isles* of the nations;" *Iyyai haggoyim*, as in Gen. x, 5.

The old name, and the one afterwards retained by the later Greeks, for all these early pioneers, was *Pelasgi*,—the earlier form, probably, *Pelaxi* or *Pelagsi*. The failure of every attempt to get any meaning for this from any of the Hellenic dialects, is proof of its foreign origin. The derivation of it from the Hebrew פֶּלֶג (Palag or Phalag) was once thought to stand on a good foundation, but has been somewhat contemptuously rejected, in certain quarters, as unscholarly. Such a decision, however, should not be allowed to bar out all examination of its claims. It may have as much in its favor as the derivation of Strabo and Ælian, quoted by Bochart, and sustained by some modern authorities, which makes it from *pelargos*, a stork, or that of Donaldson in his *Cratylus* (sec. 95), which makes it the same phonetically, and the same in meaning, with Pelops. *Palag*, or *Pelag*, certainly seems to have more phonetic resemblance to *Pelag* than either of these (the introduction of the letter *s* being quite in harmony with such forms as *μῶς* for *μυ*, or the metathesis *σκ* for *κς γς*, for *κ* or *γ*), but this is not

conclusive; since such resemblance is sometimes merely accidental, and words may be closely allied etymologically that have very little of such outward similarity, or have lost nearly all traces of what they may have once possessed. A better argument is derived from the clear and most suitable meaning which the Shemitic origin would give it, especially as connected with what may be supposed to have been the ground and source of its first application. The great objection to this etymology has arisen from its seeming to favor the hypothesis that the Pelasgian, or early Greek language (which must have been very nearly the same) was derived from the Shemitic. This certainly was not the case. The sons of Javan had a very different tongue from the very commencement of their migrations, although it is also true that a great many roots in Greek (whether from later introduction or any other cause) are capable of being identified with Hebrew or Phœnician. In aid of this objection has been the kindred idea that the name must have been one given by the Pelasgi to themselves, or first assigned to them by the later Greeks. In defense of this latter supposition, or rather in taking it for granted, Donaldson maintains (see *Cratylus* 95 and note) "that the name given to the foreigners by the Greeks who spoke about them would, more probably, be a term significant in their own language, than a foreign word which conveyed no meaning to those who used it." The first fault in this argument is the regarding of the Pelasgi as foreigners to "the Greeks who spoke about them." They were rather aborigines, or prior settlers of the same original race, driven on by a later wave of migration. Equally controversial, to say the least, is the position that the name could not have been a foreign one, or that it must have been given by the Pelasgi, or Javanites, to themselves. Only admit the naturalness of the contrary supposition and the case becomes clear. Whatever may have been the cause (and we do not think that philology will ever find a more probable one than that assigned *Gen. xi, 7-9*), the sons of Javan carried with them a language both radically and structurally very different from the Shemitic, though closely related to that of another tribe of wanderers who, in this early period of univer-

sal migration, went east to India. But this is not at all inconsistent with the idea of proper names coming afterwards from another, or a foreign source. It is not at all likely that these roving, dispersed adventurers would think of giving a common or collective name to themselves. The Phœnicians were among the earliest established people. They followed with their trade these pioneering men of the West. Whenever the latter formed settlements on the capes, and isles, and secluded coasts of the Mediterranean, even to far Italy and Spain, the Phœnician ships, with their ubiquitous commerce, were soon after them. Homer pictures this very vividly, though at a much later time. The arrival of such a Phœnician vessel, and some adventure connected with it, form quite a frequent and familiar episode, especially in the *Odyssey*. A commercial intercourse of this kind must have had much to do with this early naming. The foreign traders would first see the necessity of some general or collective epithet, and they would be the first to supply the want. As history has shown in other cases, appellations thus coming from a foreign source become easily naturalized in the native language, and especially would this be the case with a general name thus applied, in distinction from the tribal designations more familiarly employed among the settlers themselves. The attempt to find the meaning or origin of the name *Pelasgi* in the earlier or later Greek, would be very much the same as if some latter day antiquarian should rack his brain to get the source and significance of Australian, Canadian, or Yankee, out of the languages afterwards spoken in the regions to which these epithets are applied.* They all came from abroad and so did *Pelasgi*. Thus, while the

* There is a perfectly analogous example furnished by the name *Welshmen*, which was not given by themselves to the people so called, but had a foreign origin. It denotes *wanderers* (German *Wallen*, Saxon *Wealh*). So Italy was called by the Germans *Wälschland*, or *Welshland*. See *New Am. Cyclopædia*, art. *Wales*.

The name *Pelasgi* having been thus given by the foreign traders, it is easy to see how it would become adopted among the scattered clans and tribes between whom the Phœnicians were the principal medium of intercourse. Indeed it would be difficult to point out how a *common* designation of these widely branching and scattering people could ever have arisen in any other way. The name *Greek* did not become universal for the later inhabitants until it was employed in that way by the Romans.

early Greeks called themselves Hellenes, Ionians, etc., the foreign traders would have one name for them all, and this, as borne by them from place to place, would come into universal use. Such was sometimes the case even with more local and special designations, like the Kadmeans from Kadmus (*Kedem*) the East. It is this consideration that rescues the Shemitic derivation of Pelagi, Pelaxi, (Pelag-si) Pelasgi, from that contempt with which some would treat it in their strange desire to banish everything Shemitic (perhaps because it is so closely connected with the biblical) from the consideration of the philologist. If the name is Phœnician, or, in other words, from a language almost identical with the Hebrew, then what other root, it may be demanded, has a better claim than *Palag*, either as regards sound or sense.* It must have been frequent in the Phœnician. It has a clear and pertinent sense, in every way adapted to such a use. These Javanic rovers were continually making new marts for the Tyrian commerce; they were dispersing everywhere, stopping at every isle, ascending every stream, making settlements in every nook and corner of this sea-washed land. What more graphic epithet, then, could their frequent Phœnician visitors have employed in describing them than *Pelagim*, which, with a slight change in the vowel, would mean *the divided* or *the dividers*. It is in fact identical with the description given of this very people, Gen. x, 5: "By these *were divided* the isles of the nations in their lands." It is true, the word rendered *divided* here is not the same, but it is, to all intents, synonymous with נִפְלְגָה, Gen. x, 25, and either word might be substituted, in the respective places, without in the least changing the image or the idea. It does not at all detract from the inspiration, that is, the divine authority, of that remarkable genealogical chart, Gen. x, to suppose it to have been, as to the letter, compiled from various authentic ancient sources. The extensive geographical knowledge of the Phœnicians must have made them an authority at the

* Dr. Rôth, cited by Donaldson, advocates the claims of the Phœnicians to a large share in the early cultivation of Greece, and so would find the origin of the name *Pelasgi* in that language. He makes it, however, from the same root with *Philistine*, which certainly has far less reason, either phonetic or historic, than the one we have maintained.

time when it was written, however early we may set it. This is in accordance, too, with an idea maintained by some of the most trustworthy commentators, that the Table has, to a great extent, a Phœnician origin, or that portion of it, at least, that relates to the Mediterranean settlements. It is more than probable, then, that in the words above cited we have the very language of the Phœnician document, and that such language was suggested by the very idea which, before or afterwards, gave rise to this name. There is another consideration which favors this etymology. Palag is not the most common Hebrew word for dividing, or cutting, although it comes near enough to it to be so rendered. It has rather, in *Kal*, the intransitive sense of *branching*, *parting* into limbs, or streams. In the use of the name, then, the foreign traders would pictorially describe them as the *branching* people, ever settling new places, and this would be in graphic contrast with their own home life, or the Tyrian state as confined to its own narrow and unchanging territory. Such a use of the term suggests what Herodotus says of the Hellenes as afterwards *divided* from the general Pelasgi: τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἀποσχισθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ; I, 58 (see Rawlinson). The verb he uses (ἀποσχιζομαι), is, in other places, most commonly employed by him * to describe such a division of streams, branching out or dividing themselves from the main channel; and this, as every Hebrew scholar knows, is the most significant use of the Hebrew or Phœnician noun *peleg*; as in Psalm i, 3, פִּלְגֵי מַיִם, *channels*, "*rivers of waters*," (applied more to artificial than to natural streams) and so in other places. If we only admit that the name may be of Phœnician origin, no other word in the Hebrew or Phœnician language could be better adapted to such a purpose, or would more readily suggest itself to a foreigner as a name for such a peculiarly branching or spreading people.

Among the earliest of these far-dispersing tribes were the Dodanim,* already mentioned as settling the extreme West of Greece. They brought with them this yearning for some

*See Herodotus II, 17; vii, 233, &c.

†The LXX Version 'Ρόδιοι, *Rhodians*, comes clearly from mistaking the Hebrew *D* for *R*.

divine intercourse which had been, more or less, a favorite idea in the old Eastern ancestral land. The wilderness country into which they came intensified the desire, and in its solemn oak groves they easily fancied that they heard whisperings, and murmuring sounds, reminding them of the paternal Deity of whom tradition told as walking among the trees of the garden and inquiring for one who was lost,—God seeking man, and thus giving the highest encouragement to that converse desire for divine communication, in some form, which has ever been so strong in the human breast. Was it all imagination, or may there not have been some objective reality in it? Who knows enough of the ways of God, or of the deep things of the human soul, to venture an unhesitating answer in the negative? Subsequent abuse and idolatry do not disprove a real sacredness of origin, as could be shown by clearest scriptural proof. Equally strong is the evidence, from the Bible itself, that the stream of divine revelation, ever following after the human apostacy, was not confined to the Jews. There were glimpses of it given to other peoples, out of the Abrahamic, and even the Shemitic line. The Philistine Abimelech had a vision of God; the Elohim came to him with a special revelation, Gen. xx, 2. The Canaanite Melchizedek was an oracular as well as sacrificing priest of El Elyon, God most high. The Pharaoh of Joseph's day speaks like a worshiper of the Jehovah who appeared to him in dreams, and sent to him an interpreting messenger. So was it with Baalam, the prophetic son of the East, to whose ecstatic vision the roll of the future was so widely opened. Abundant evidence of the same kind is furnished in the book of Job. A knowledge of our Lord, and of his advent, was somehow given, from an earlier or later source, to contemplative souls in far-off Persia. These examples are not made known that we should confine ourselves to them. There may have been many others not recorded, even as there are mentioned sacred histories that have been lost. We should not, therefore, be shocked, or even startled at the question: Did these early wanderers really hear something divine in the woods of Dodona, leading them to regard it as an oracular spot, like Bethel or

Mizpah to the Jews? There is nothing irrational, nothing incredible, nothing contrary to the Scriptures, in such a supposition. The gross delusion and imposture which marked the later oracular seats (though Dodona ever preserved a deeper impression of solemnity) would not militate against the idea. It was so in Judea and in Israel. Sacred relics were turned into objects of profane worship; the calves of Jeroboam were set up in the consecrated spot where Jacob, by the divine command, had built his altar; lying prophets and false visions mingled themselves with the true. So the cheats at Delphi present no absolute bar to believing in a primitive sacredness at Dodona. There may have been a true "inquiring of God," and after God, at that early day, by men who had not wholly lost the old patriarchal traditions; and if so, we may heartily believe our Bibles, and yet indulge the thought that, in some accordance with their dim aspirations, and their faint "gropings" (Acts xvii, 27) he may have been "found of them." The spirit of the declaration warrants us in taking it in its largest sense: "He hath never said to the sons of Adam, seek ye my face in vain." It is very precious, this idea of God as ever seeking our lost humanity, following it through the wilderness, ever striving, as it were, to hold intercourse with it, until there intervenes that dense cloud of wickedness, sensuality, or gross idolatry, through which no ray of heavenly light can penetrate. They may have heard a voice in the deep, solemn grove,—such a voice as sounded through the sin-desolated Eden—Ye sons of Javan, where are ye? or as it came to the ears of the fleeing prophet, in the cave at Horeb: Why art thou here Elijah? Why wander ye so far, seeking the ἄγνωστον θεόν, the "unknown God," or good? He whom your fathers worshiped is still present in this distant land,* "not far from

*It appears from 1 Maccabees xii, 21, (Septuagint) that there had ever remained, among the Jews, a traditional remembrance of some early kinship between them and the Greeks. It is brought up as an argument for a proposed treaty of alliance; "For it has been found in writing (ἐν γραφῇ) concerning the Spartans and the Jews, that they are brethren, and that they are of the race of Abraham." The reference to the writing may have been to the Genealogical Table, Gen. x, 4. With the substitution of Javan (grandson of Noah) for Abraham, it would be literally correct.

any one of you; in him ye live, and move, and have your being." "Ye are his offspring;" so said afterwards the ancient Grecian poet whom Paul quotes, and it may have been but an echo from some such earlier voice. This is all imagination, it may be said. If it were so, it would still be a legitimate exercise of the faculty, bringing us nearer, it may be, to the substantial, underlying truth, than any dry rationalizing criticism, or attempted fact-exploration of a region in respect to which history gives us only the most shadowy intimations.

It is worthy of note, too, that to the oak, which was a peculiarity of this place, and which was so closely connected with the earliest Dodonæan worship, there seems to have been attached a primitive sacredness, referred to in the Scriptures, and not condemned until it had become an occasion of idolatry. Abraham dwelt in Aloné Mamre, "in the oaks of Mamre." The place was probably selected by him as one favorable to contemplation and devotion. There "came to him the word of the Lord" (Gen. xv, 1), there he had a divine vision, and there God made a covenant with him. It was a most appropriate temple for the divine worship,—shaded, secluded, solemn, while presenting objects suggestive, in the highest degree, of strength and majesty. Under the oak was also a place of burial. Thus Rebecca was buried, "and they called its name Aloné Bakoṯh," the oak of weeping. Under the oak Joshua placed a pillar in commemoration of the Covenant (Josh. xxiv, 26). It was under the oak at Ophrah that the angel gave the oracle to Gideon (Judg. vi, 11). It is spoken of as a well-known place ("the oak which is in Ophrah"), perhaps of solemn convocation; "and there Gideon built an altar." It was under "the oak of Muzzab, which is in Shechem, that the men of Shechem came to make Abimelech king," Judg. ix, 6. See also 1 Chron. x, 12. When such oaks, or groves of oak, became objects of idolatry and superstition, then was the prophet's denouncing voice lifted against them: "For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which they have loved," Isaiah i, 29. See also Isaiah lvi, 5. The style of condemnation, however, shows that they had once been regarded

with a feeling pure and sacred, before their abuse had brought them under the displeasure of the Almighty.

We may regard it as having been thus comparatively pure among these early sons of Javan. Their oak-worship was a practice, and an idea, which they had carried with them from the fatherland, and here, in the densely shaded Dodona, they found a place beyond most others adapted to its exercise. It degenerated soon into the superstitious worship of the unknown god, and, in proportion as it departed from the primitive simplicity, became irrational, idolatrous, or gloomily ascetic. This religion, however, of Western Greece, never assumed that foul, bacchanalian, purely sensual aspect which characterized the Hellenic heathenism in other parts. With the worship at Dodona, there was ever maintained a rigid austerity, a monastic asceticism even, which gave it dignity, and a moral power, surpassing any that ever came from the fanciful, poetical, merely æsthetic worship of Athens and Corinth. Much as we may condemn the extravagances of such fanaticism, still we are compelled to acknowledge something in it which demands our respect, if not our reverence. We can not think meanly of St. Anthony, or even of Simeon Stylites. And so in the unsanded, unkempt, and abstemious Selli, the priests or devotees of the Dodonæan Monastery, there must have been a spiritual strength, and a spiritual depth of idea, unknown to all other Greek religion, or even Greek philosophy. Whatever may be its excesses, or delusions, the mortification of the *flesh*, even as exhibited in those who dwelt in caves and on the tops of pillars,—is still a sublime testimony to the devotees' appreciation of the vastly higher worth of the soul. In the unguarded language of some zealous Protestant writers, asceticism has been denounced as squalid and *beastly*; yet surely there is nothing in which man differs more directly from the animal, than in the idea of voluntary pain endured for the health of the spirit, real or supposed. The ascetic tendency in the Dodonæan religion, which may be regarded as in this respect standing almost alone in Greece, came doubtless from the shaded, sober, and gloomy character of its origin. Such liability to abuse may have been one cause

of the later condemnation of grove-worship in the Scriptures, though there is evidence that in the East there was no little mingling of sensuality with its rites. The prohibition of it could not have been on account of anything essentially wrong in itself. As our best poet has said,

“The groves were God’s first temples;”

and though afterwards this mode of worship was forbidden, as leading the chosen people into those practices of the surrounding nations from which—for reasons having a world-wide interest—they were to be kept separate, still may we hold to the rationality, and comparative innocency, of the feeling which first led to it. It is true that the word most commonly rendered *grove* in our translation, denotes rather an idol worshiped in such places, than the grove itself; but the idolatry arose out of the corruptions of the original purer observances of devotion in the dense and sombre shades. They became, too, places used for gross, and even obscene rites, for which their darkness and seclusion were most opportune. There does not seem to have been much of this at Dodona, as there was elsewhere in the *τέμενος* attached to the Grecian temples; but among the idolatrous nations of the East, grove worship was very early perverted to the vilest licentiousness, and so, in the eyes of the Hebrew prophets, it became the very symbol of abomination.

The oracle of Dodona differed from that of Delphi, and others of Greece, in being dedicated alone to Zeus, and in being supposed to receive all its responses from him. Elsewhere, and later, Apollo was the deity mainly consulted. Delphi, however, is not even alluded to in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, and the mention of it in the Hymns entitled Homeric is an evidence against their title to the name. The fact of Dodona being so exclusively devoted to the supreme deity, whether regarded in the monotheistic or the monarchotheistic aspect, has an important bearing upon the right view of its character and antiquity. It was by far the oldest of the Grecian oracles, and may be regarded as, in some sense, the mother of them all, the primitive source whence the oracular idea had its origin and perpetuation. *Æschylus* places it away back in the Titanic period. *Inachus*, the earliest king of Argos, son of

Oceanus and Tethys, consults it in respect to his daughter Io, the mysterious, transformed, wandering woman, whose seed was to deliver Prometheus, the benefactor of mankind. Homer uses it, together with Pelasgian, as an epithet of the most ancient Zeus, the Pelasgian or Javanic Zeus, far back in the ante-Homeric times, before the Cretan apotheosis, before the coming in of that countless mythological rabble of whom Hesiod sings, and with whom Homer himself most inconsistently, and sometimes even grotesquely, associates him. Thus does he invoke this most ancient deity, *Iliad*, xvi, 233 :

Ζεῦ ἄνα Δωδωναίῃ Πελασγικῇ τηλόθι ναίων,
 Δωδώνῃς μεδέων δυσχειμέρου· ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ
 Σοὶ ναῖουσ' ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες, χαμαιεῦναι.

"O Zeus Dodonæan, *Pelasgian*, dwelling afar, sovereign of stormy Dodona, around thee dwell the Selli, thy divining prophets, with feet unwashed, lying upon the ground." These Selli were the ascetic priests before mentioned, whose austerity presents such a contrast to the earlier, sensual Greek religion of later days. They are also mentioned by Strabo and others, but there is little more known of them than is called up by these few graphic lines of Homer. The connection of Pelasgian, here, with Dodona, is most significant. In the mind of Homer, this oracle, or sacred place, is associated with the idea of the earlier people, and of a more ancient Zeus whom they worshiped with rites most simple, indeed, but of hoar antiquity. It was remote from the later conception, even of the poet's own day. This Dodonæan, Pelasgian deity was one "who dwelt afar," not so much in geographical space—for Dodona could in no sense be called distant to one familiar, as Homer was, with Epirus and the Ionian Isles—but in glory, age, and height of being. It was some power of whom there had come down a traditional knowledge, as of one who "dwelt afar" from the lowered images of the later mythology,—some older, holier, separate deity, transcending the conception entertained of the Idæan or Olympian Zeus, much as that excels the picture given of the other Homeric deities. Even the more common epithets of Zeus, in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, point to a purer ante-Homeric theology. They were not then first invented. The poet adopts the

just as he finds them in the older hymnic or oracular verse, and strangely mingles them with gross and incongruous fables savoring of a later origin. He doubtless felt the poetical power of this earlier language, and yet, perhaps, without fully appreciating the glory of the ideas they actually expressed, or the greatness of the being to whom they had been applied. They had made their way down to him from the patriarchial times, ever struggling with the surrounding darkness as it became more and more dense, like the pale sunbeams in an eclipse, or the refracted light shining dimly through discoloring and distorting fogs.

A thoughtful man, especially if conversant with the Bible, can not read Homer without feeling that there is something very wonderful here. Even the physical epithets place Zeus far above all other things that are called gods, whether in heaven or upon earth. There is a separating majesty about them which shows that they once were peculiar to a monotheistic belief. All the higher powers of nature are wielded by Jove as his special prerogative, or, if by others, it is only as his delegates or messengers. The names thus derived constantly suggest something corresponding to them in the Old Testament. Thus Zeus is called *νεφεληγερέτα*, the "storm gatherer;" "His way is in the whirlwind and the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet." Nah. i, 3. A frequent epithet in Homer is *κελαινεφής*, which is almost a literal translation of Ps. xcvi, 2, before cited; "clouds and darkness are round about him," or of Ps. xviii, 12: "He maketh darkness his pavilion, thick clouds of the skies." Homer styles Zeus *εὐρύοπα*, "far-seeing," in space and time; compare the Psalmist, xxxiii, 14: "From his immovable throne he looketh forth upon all the dwellers upon earth." Another epithet is *ὑψιμέδων*, "high ruling," or ruling on high; Ps. ciii, 19: "The Lord hath fixed his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Zeus is called in Homer *ὑψίζυγος*, high at the helm, or, more correctly, "high at the scales,"—the "lofty weigher," of the destinies of men and nations. How impressive and significant is this figure in the Scriptures! "He weigheth the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance." It is not physical objects merely; "He pondereth, (Heb. weigh-

eth) the ways of men ;" " thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." There are many others of this kind which will readily suggest themselves to one who, in reading the Homeric poems, keeps ever in mind the sublime natural epithets of Deity as they appear in the oldest parts of the Bible.

Of a still higher order are certain moral representations which astonish us by their striking resemblance to some scriptural ideas. The divine justice is exhibited in the figure of the balance just mentioned. It appears still more significantly in the Homeric symbolical representations of Diké and Themis, (retribution and law) as sitting at the right hand of Zeus, and sharing his throne. The physical here is combined with the moral, as in Ps. xvii, 2: "clouds and darkness are round about him, but Justice and Truth are the support of his throne." Under this head we find a remarkable expression which may well excite our wonder in respect to its origin. It certainly seems to approach the scriptural, to say the least, in the conception it raises of the supreme Deity. Homer styles him *Ζεὺς μῆδεα ἀφθίτα εἰδώς* (see *Iliad*, xxiv, 88), literally, "Knowing imperishable thoughts," God of eternal ideas, whose purposes never fail, whose great designs, in history or in nature, suffer neither change nor decay. Hesiod uses the same expression, which certainly seems to show that both poets, instead of borrowing one from the other, derived it from an older source. The Bible language corresponding to this can not fail to suggest itself to every thoughtful reader, the chief difference being that the Hebrew, as more devotional, is mainly in the first and second person: "Canst thou by searching find out God?" Job xi, 7; "For as the heavens are high above the earth, so are my ways above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts," Isa. lv, 9; "Thy thoughts, O Lord, are very deep," Ps. xcii, 5; "Thy footsteps are unknown," Ps. lxxvii, 19; "Thy judgments (*μῆδεα*, purposes, providences,) are a great abyss"* Ps. xxxvi,

*Eschylus has more of this Homeric, or rather ante Homeric phraseology, than any other of the dramatic poets. In the *Suppliants*, 1055, he uses this same figure in just the same way,

*τί δ' ἐ μέλλω φρένα Διὸς
καθορᾶν ἄβυσσον;*

"O how shall I survey the mind of Jove?
Abyss profound!"

The Psalmist has the word *tehom*, the great *abyss* of Genesis!

6; "Thy counsels of old are faithfulness and truth," more correctly, "Thy counsels (LXX, βουλαί, μῆδεα, cogitationes) from afar, are firmness, security," Isaiah xxv, 1. The two Hebrew words here correspond, both of them, to the Greek ἀφθίτα in expressing that which is *unfailing* and undecaying. Such is the true import of the word, and although, after it has been introduced into poetical language, it may be used as a good sounding, suitable epithet, without much regard to its high significance, this would not have been the case in that primitive, ante-Homeric application of the term in a connection that thus demanded its highest power. Homer may not have meant so much by it, but this does not detract from its archaic sublimity.

It is not an irrational supposition that these phrases, coming down from an older thinking, and from an older form, of the language, still held the relics of patriarchal conceptions, faded traces, it may be, of germinal ideas, such as were preserved in greatest strength and purity in the Jewish Scriptures. They were carried away by the sons of Javan from the old Noachian home, and treasured afterwards in this earliest oracular seat of Dodona, dedicated, as it was, to the One Supreme, and once universally adored, ancestral Deity. Such, too, may have been the secret wisdom stored up in the mysteries, or τελεταί, which figure in the earliest history of Greece and of the preceding Pelasgi. The deposit seemed so precious that ascetic priests were appointed as its special guardians. Hence the austere Selli before mentioned, esteemed most holy, and about whom there was such an air of antiquity, even in Homer's day. The study of Homer himself shows that monotheism must have been first, even in the early Grecian mind. It is much easier to show how nature worship, and its offspring, the gross polytheistic rabble, came from the degeneracy of this most simple yet most sublime idea of One God ruling in the heavens, and over angelic hosts, than it would be to reverse the argument. A religion like that of Abraham and Noah would never, of itself, have arisen from a preceding grossness of belief in any way resembling that which prevailed in the days of Homer and Hesiod. It is easier to trace the deteriorating causes, than to find in his-

tory any evidence of that refining, purifying, and simplifying process which the opposite theory demands.

Facilis descensus Averni;
Sed revocare gradum, superas que evadere ad auras,
Hoc opus, hic labor est.

Men have never reversed their steps, or taken this upward course, from any inherent law of spiritual progress, or without aid from a foreign source, and that traceable, in every case, to some connection with a divine revelation, or to some interposition which history can not otherwise explain. Whatever may have been, at times, the dangerous and suicidal progress of an illusive civilization, the moral and spiritual tendency of human history has never changed this order. In the religious aspect, certainly, and in the intellectual as far as connected with it, the way of unaided humanity is ever downward, away from God, tending ever to grosser and still grosser religious conceptions, or to their utter extinction. In this respect, such writers as Buckle, Lecky, and Lubbock, may be safely challenged to produce a solitary example of the "higher man" ever coming out of "the lower." Savagism, *as now found*, is the remains always of a previously better state, which may, to some extent, be traced in history. Without help from abroad, it never rises,—always sinks into a still lower and more helpless degradation. This ought not to be. The fact, however, that it is so, shows that there is something wrong about man; some great evil has, at some time, befallen him. History testifies to the fact, and its consequences on every page of its long record. It is only, however, when we study our Bibles that we clearly discover what this evil is, and how it came.

There is another one of these ancient monotheistic expressions that meets us very often in Homer, and suggests the same thoughts in respect to its ante-Homeric origin. Zeus is styled *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*, "Father of gods and men." In the earlier polytheistic stages, the conception attached to *θεοί*, in the plural, would not differ widely from that of angels in the older Scripture. Thus even in Homer, *Iliad*, ii, 94, Ossa is styled *Διὸς ἄγγελος*, and Iris and Hermes were regarded in the same light, as angels or mes-

sengers of Jove, sent forth to "minister" in the affairs of men. In Scripture, angels are styled *bené Elohim*, sons of God, and the title is virtually extended to men in the language of Numbers xvi, 22, אֱלֹהֵי הָרוּחֹת לְכָל בָּשָׂר, "God of the spirits (as he is elsewhere styled 'Father of spirits') to all flesh." The great significance, however, of this expression, consists in its denoting independent, underived being, and, at the same time, the מְקוֹר הַיַּיִם (Ps. xxxvi, 10), or "fountain of light" to all lower existences. Homer may not have had any such high idea as this, so closely resembling what was given to Moses in the vision of the burning bush; he may have simply adopted the archaic formula as representing something very great and majestic; but the language itself most clearly separates Zeus, or the supreme God, from all the other deities. It places him at a distance infinitely remote from them, not in strength and age merely, but in the very nature, kind, and rank of being.

But it is not alone in the grander, sterner, and more fearful attributes of the Jovean character that Homer presents such resemblances to the holier and earlier truth. There are, occasionally, most touching expressions of love, compassion, and tenderness, that seem, in some faint degree, to assimilate the conception of the Idæan Jove to the God of the Psalmist and the Prophets. Mercy appears in his character, as well as Justice and Retribution. He has pity upon men, he has a feeling for their infirmities, he compassionates their struggling, perishing state. We have a touching example of this in what may be called the lamentation of Zeus, (*Iliad*, xxii, 168) for the noble but most unfortunate Hector, in the dire extremity of his fate:

ὦ πόποι, ἦ φίλον ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περὶ τεῖχος
 Ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρᾶμαι ἐμὸν, δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ
 "Εκτορος ———

Alas, the man beloved! with mine own eyes,
 That I should thus behold him fiercely driven
 Around his native walls! My very soul,
 It mourns for Hector.*

*This is one of the passages which Plato cites in condemnation of Homer's anthropopathism. "We must beg him," he says (*Republic*, iii,

As in the similar scriptural style, it is the anthropopathism which some would cavil at, that makes the very power of the passage. He would have saved his life, but one of those *μηδ' ἄφθιτα*, or "imperishable counsels," which the poet ascribes to him, stands in the way of such an interposition. Hector, the pious, God-fearing man, who never failed in offering the sacrifice of propitiation—Hector, the righteous man, who acknowledged the political wrong, yet who so bravely fought on, even under the sad foreboding of his own doom, as well as that of his native city (*Iliad*, vi, 447)—Hector must die for his country's sins; he falls as a victim to the great doctrine of national retribution, but he who sitteth in the heavens is represented as giving a sigh to his memory, and mourning, as it were, over the moral necessity that required the offering up of a life so brave and patriotic. It is sublime, morally impressive, scriptural, we may say, both in thought and language. So God seems to be represented, *Gen.* viii, 21, as sorrowing over our flood-desolated earth, though not only justice, but mercy to future humanity, had demanded the stern infliction of the awful sentence. Thus, too, is he represented, on other occasions, as "repenting," as being "grieved at his heart." Never does infidelity appear so odious as when carping at language so full of divine condescension to our human sphere of thought, as well as so indicative of the profoundest theological mystery.

A somewhat similar picture is presented, *Iliad*, xxiv, 330, when Priam sets out, with no other attendant than his aged charioteer, on his sad journey to the hostile camp. The appearance of these two lonely, decrepit pilgrims—the melancholy object of the journey—the recovery of Hector's mangled remains—affect the heart of Zeus, and call out his tenderest pity:

τὼ δ' ὃν λάθον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν'
'Ες πεδίον προφανέντε, ἸΔΩΝ δ' 'ΕΛΕ΄ ΗΞΕ γέροντα.

p. 388, c.) "not to represent the Gods as mourning, nor the Supreme God as uttering such exclamations as these: O wonder, that I see a beloved man, etc." We need, however, have no hesitation in maintaining that the poet's conception of the divine, in such passages, is better than that of the philosopher. The objection of the latter is very much like the cavil against the Bible, that it represents God as repenting, etc.

With what power and vividness, and yet with what simplicity, is this sudden touch of compassion set forth in the momentary significance of the aorist tense :

Two feeble forms

Emerging on the plain, yet not concealed
From him who sees afar. *One glance* he gave,
And straight took pity on the aged man ;
Then summoned Hermes, messenger divine.
Hermes, thou claimest to be the friend of man,
Thou hearest when he prays ; now haste thee forth,
To guide and guard his unprotected way.

"He shall give his angel charge over thee." We think of the interposition on behalf of Hagar lost in the wilderness, and of other narratives of angelic appearances recorded in Genesis. It is not that we would profanely place Homer on a par with the Bible, or represent him as making any near approach to it ; the object is rather to show that his best representations of deity are dim reflections of a much earlier and holier light.

The reader will pardon us if we cite another example of this kind, *Iliad*, xx, 21. The scene is just before the great battle, and in anticipation of it. The field of the deadly combat is in sight. The leaders on both sides are marshalling their tumultuous hosts "insatiable for the fight," the Greeks around the dreadful Pelides, the Trojans ἐπὶ θρωσμοῖ πεδίοιο, "upon the spring of the plain," awaiting the fatal rush. The other deities are furious for the strife. Not only Mars, "the beastly homicide," but Apollo god of light, the grave Poseidon, even Athene patroness of art and wisdom, are all hastening to the mêlée, raging against each other, and exhibiting the same low views, the same gross enmities, that mark the human combatants. It is one of those cases that might be brought as strongest proof of the Homeric feature to which we have already alluded—the immense moral difference between Zeus (marred as his picture is by some of the most absurd fables) and the other powers of the later polytheism. The "Father of Gods and Men" sits aloft and far apart, holding on high the golden scales, in which he weighs the destinies of the contending hosts, intent upon plans and "imperishable purposes," looking far beyond the present

issue. He casts his eye upon the battle-field, and the sight calls out an exclamation most remarkable, indeed, yet whose brevity, and extreme simplicity, have caused it to be wholly overlooked by the mere verbal critics. Short as it is, the feeling of divine compassion seems to overflow the few words in which it is uttered :

—— μέλουσί μοι ὀλλύμενοί περ.

There is an exquisite pathos in that little particle *περ*, which no mode of translating in English will adequately reach. It represents here a contrast between the divine permanency, the divine eternity, and the transitory frailty of man. Or it may be taken as intensifying the significance of the participle, and we can only render it by adding to our words : “poor perishing men—poor dying men.” A still deeper touch of the pathetic is in the word *μέλουσι* : “perishing though they be, they concern me.” The impersonal or indirect style adds to the tenderness : “They are a care to me, they affect me ;” as in the scriptural expression, 1 Pet. v, 7, *ἀντὶ τοῦ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν*, literally, “there is a care to him,” “it concerns Him for you,” or, rendered directly, “He careth for you.” What can add to the power of such words ?

They move my heart, those dying men.

We can not keep out of mind the language of the Scripture : “He knoweth our frame ; he remembereth that we are dust.”

Another feature in the character of the Homeric Zeus, but to which we can only refer here with the utmost brevity, is found in the ascription to him of a special care for the poor, the stranger, and the friendless. It is sufficient to direct the reader to such passages as *Odyss.* vi, 206, xiv, 56, xvii, 484, where these classes of persons are declared to be, in a most peculiar manner, the divine wards ; they belong especially to Jove, and wrong done to them is sure to meet with retribution. How emphatically does this voice sound throughout the Scriptures : God of the oppressed, God of the poor, of the afflicted, the stranger, the widow, and the fatherless. Let the reader compare such texts as *Deut.* xxiv, 17 ; xxvii, 19 ; *Ps.* x, 18 ; *Jer.* xxii, 3 ; *Zach.* vii, 10. The days succeeding the Trojan war were marked, throughout Greece, by violence and wrong of every kind. Moral precepts so

pure, so merciful, so holy, we may say, could not have had their origin in such a condition of society. Ideas of the divine character like these must be traced to a much older source, even to a period which will bring them within some degree of kindred to the patriarchal conceptions from which afterward flowed this similar language of Moses and the prophets.

We would conclude the present article with a brief examination of some of the divine names in Genesis, and a comparison of them with the most majestic of these Homeric epithets, both moral and physical. There are three worthy of special notice in this respect: *El Shaddai*, rendered *Almighty*, but denoting, generally, greatness in *power* and *glory*, *El Olam*, *eternity*, and *El Elyon*, or *height*, in any way considered, whether in altitude or rank. The most general conceptions corresponding to them would be, God in space, God in time, God in supremacy or transcendency of being. We may figure the latter by altitude in space, relative or absolute, but that is only a type of the idea. It is worthy our deepest attention how gloriously all these names stand out in that most ancient Hebrew book which some would so slightly speak of as a mere mythical primer, adapted to the infancy, and most childish conceptions, of mankind. To the second of these, *El Olam*, or the Eternal God, we fail to find any very distinct correspondence of epithet in Homer, although it may be regarded as implied in that frequent expression: "Father of gods and men." Underived being is there, and, of course, eternity, as the negation of any origin in time. The word *αιώνιος*, however, as an epithet, does not occur in Homer, and *αἰδιος*, of which Plato is fond, is found only in one of the hymns. *Αἰιγενέτης* would be very appropriate, etymologically, but it is applied to all the gods, or to the gods collectively, which is very inconsistent, since in the Hesiodian theogony, which is like the Homeric in this respect, all the gods were *born* in time. So in Hesiod there is a genealogy of Zeus himself—wherein he differs from the greater poet, who makes Zeus the fountain of being. Of the other Hebrew epithets in Genesis, we are reminded by language in Homer, whether it be his own, or derived

from some older effort to represent the unapproachable greatness. As one example, we may cite again that invocation of the old Dodonæan, Pelasgian, or Javanic Zeus, *Iliad*, xvi, 223. In that place, the expression *τηλόδι ναίων*, "dwelling afar," which we have seen could not refer to any geographical remoteness, may be taken in either the space, time, or rank aspect. It denotes a being inconceivably above us, far from us, exceeding all our conceptions of age, power, and glory. It was the language of the oracle itself, associated ever with its invocation; and this was what it anciently strove to express. Homer's frequent *Ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε*, used in oaths and most solemn invocations (Jove most glorious, most great), correspond well to the Hebrew *El Shaddai*; and the other epithet, at the end of that repeated line,

Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε, κελαινεφές, αἰθέρι ναίων,

is almost a translation of *El Elyon*. Jove, who dwells in the æther, the height, the heaven, and heaven of heavens, he is *El Elyon*, the Most High. The æther was above the atmosphere, where the lower gods, born in time, had their residence. It was the vast height, or illimitable space, optically represented, in every direction, by the phenomenal, spherical sky. Hence *αἰθέρι ναίων* corresponds, word for word, to another Hebrew expression, *Isaiah xxxiii, 5*, שָׁן מְרוֹם, "dwelling in the height," *inhabitans altitudinem*. In *Isaiah lvii, 15*, it is joined with another word as though explanatory of its more spiritual meaning: מְרוֹם וְקָדֵשׁ, "dwelling high and holy," that is, *separate* and *pure*, *far removed* from all that is earthly and gross.

But we must bring this extended article to a close. It might not be difficult to take exception to some of the examples we have cited, or to some particular inferences deduced from them; but there is certainly force in the general view here taken, and which may be thus summed up: The Zeus of the later dramatic poets, without excepting even *Æschylus*, is certainly a lower being than the Jove of the *Iliad*. The popular conception had fallen, and was falling still lower with every succeeding representation, except where relieved, as is occasionally the case in *Euripides*, by some of the dry philosophic abstractions that were coming in. On

the other hand, the general representation in Homer, and especially the great difference he makes between Zeus and the other gods, carry us back to a still higher ante-Homeric conception. But we can not stop here. Some of these remarkable epithets, so far above any invention of Homer, or of his day, point to a time even earlier than this—some age of less outward progress, perhaps, but of purer, simpler, grander thought, in which they had their origin. In Homer, they stand associated with much that is vile and debasing. There must have been a time when they appeared separate from all this grossness. Their origin could not have been simultaneous with it, or posterior, although it is not difficult to understand how they might have maintained some place amid the subsequent flood of impurity. Even the sublime, physical epithets lead to this thought of a God vastly removed from earth and man, much more those of a moral, spiritual aspect. "Father of all"—"God of imperishable counsels"—"most glorious, most great"—"dwelling afar"—"dwelling in the heavens most high"—having "compassion on perishing men," yet "weighing" their destinies in the scales of impartial justice—wielding the lightning, and having under his direct control all the mightiest forces of nature—the conception of such a God could not have arisen in the same age with that of laughter-making Vulcans, or jealous, scolding Junos, or of a Zeus frightened by the other gods, and calling to his help the hundred-handed Briareus. However much these epithets may have become mere poetical common-places in the days of Homer, they must have been distinct and significant—words "quick and powerful" (living and energizing)—at their birth. Even the physical ones, as we have said, must have had their origin in a prostrate, adoring awe of some inconceivable greatness. Add

*Iliad, xxiv, 88 :

" Whose counsel stands forever "—

Bryant.

" Lord of immortal counsel "—

Lord Derby.

Pope, though so full in many places where there was little call for it, has here entirely overlooked the sublimity of the epithet. He simply renders it :

" 'Tis Jove that calls."

to this Homer's evident attempt to present the idea of some purer Zeus of great antiquity, as in the Dodonæan invocation before cited, and we are carried back beyond the turbid epochs of the Hellenian, Dorian, and Ionian genealogies, into the Pelasgic times. Thence we easily pass to the Jayanic (if they are not really names of one and the same early migration), and so on, until we come within the outer borders of that primitive circle of light—that early conception of the divine, and of the divine government, given to us in the book of Genesis, with its sublime announcement of the God who “in the beginning created the Heavens and the Earth.”

This was the primitive revelation which contained the germinal ideas of all subsequent revelations, while Mythology, and the Natural Religion of the philosopher, have both been departures from it—the one from its *purity*, the other from its *life*—the one, an ever-growing darkness and deformity, the other, avoiding grossness, indeed, but preserving only an abstract, empty form of truth—a pale, thin, ghostly image, without the power, and life, and burning glory, of the primitive idea.

There is no mythology that is not more suggestive, more inspiring, more ennobling, than a dead materialism. Reverence may make us hesitate to bring into the comparison the Jehovah of the Scriptures, but we need not fear to say that we had better believe even in the Zeus of Homer, than in the Nous of Anaxagoras, or that “god of forces,” which is all that is left to us in such a theism as that of Spencer, Huxley, and Darwin.

ART. II.—THE SPHERE OF CIVIL LAW IN SOCIAL REFORM.

By Prof. JOHN BASCOM, Williams' College, Mass.

We can not of course, in briefly discussing the sphere of civil law in social reform, lay down explicit rules, capable of certain and easy application to all the shifting circumstances of different social states. The effort to do it would show a very partial and inadequate conception of the variety and complexity of causes that enter into each distinct social problem, and effect its practical solution. We can only hope to bring before the eye, a little more clearly, a few of the land-marks of general principles, by which the course of safe and wise action is to be directed. The complex questions of society, while receiving great light from general inquiries, demand, in each application to specific cases of the conclusions of science, a wide and thorough estimate of the exact conditions under which the hoped-for results are sought. We shall thus be saved, on the one hand, from a contemptuous arrest of principles as purely speculative, the moment we enter on practice, and, on the other, from that rigid and precipitate application of them that gives no weight to the causes at work to retard or modify their action.

In entering a harbor, whose channels are complicated and narrow, whose shoals are many and shifting, we need, not only an accurate chart of the water-courses, but also an equally careful estimate of the effects of each state of the tide. The permanent and the variable elements together, determine our safety or our danger.

Men have two distinct circles of life—an interior, or individual one, an exterior, or social one. While, on the one side, we must have the individual before we can have society; on the other, we must have society before we can have any mature individual life. Each bud of a tree is an individual, while the tree itself is a community of individuals. The height, the breadth, the proportions, the flower, the fruit which belong to the species, can be reached only through

the joint growth of many buds. The trunk, the united labor of all, lifts them aloft, while the branches, the result of divided and interdependent labors, bear each to its own portion of sunshine, and to its own office as leaf-bud or fruit-bud.

Society is as essential to men as the tree to its branches. Life is no more independent life in the one case than in the other. If, then, there were any conflict, general and inherent, between the wants of the individual and those of the community, the case would be hopeless, since neither could be sacrificed to the other without the loss of both.

There is no such conflict, yet the harmony of the two is reached in a way different from that sometimes stated. There is no perfect, attainable harmony between man and man—between man and the community, save through his moral nature. Let each selfishly, immorally pursue his own ends, and on the basis of interest alone, there is no harmony attainable except that of conflict—such an adjustment, or harmony, if you can so call it, as is reached in the insect world by prolific fecundity on the one side, and ravenous feeding on the other. Men would be divided against each other; the master against the servant, the capitalist against the laborer, the buyer against the seller, without hope of ultimate concord, were it not for the moral nature, the moral obligations and affections of both parties. The interests of men are found in final analysis to be concordant, because they are the interests of moral beings.

The lower laws of simple and pure economic action can not by and of themselves, secure the harmony of concord, can not build society up by the profit and enlargement of each of its members. We may not pause upon this point further than to indicate one or two of the facts which sustain the assertion. It is my moral nature that makes the independent prosperity of others acceptable to me. As a selfish being, as a master merely, I prefer their subjection to myself. It is in view of its effects on the moral nature of my employé, that I am willing as a capitalist that the gains of our joint undertaking shall be divided on liberal principles between us. Were it not for the inexhaustible capacity in

him of higher manhood, and my satisfaction therein, and hope therefrom, I should treat him, as far as I was able to do so, as I treat the brute, feeding it to the point of highest productiveness and no further. It is nothing but my moral nature that can ever induce me to cheerfully yield an advantage that I have over another, and nothing but his moral nature can lead me to hope in the future an advantage from such a concession. All the ideal pictures of the harmony of society in the prosperity of each of its individuals, can only be reached by the action of moral forces. The shaft may revolve in the pit, and the machinery that fills the upper floors remain still forever, without the belting that binds the two. The wheels of labor will move in vain unless moral affections are found to unite them to the prosperity of society, and maintain in quiet and successful interplay the complex mechanism of social life. First, then, the whole field is one preëminently of morals, and not simply of economy, political or otherwise.

In this social field whose harmony must be that of moral forces, ruling with and over interested impulses, whose life, like that of each person in it, must be a moral life, the question arises, what are the claims of society as compared with those of its separate members. This inquiry must be answered unhesitatingly: they are supreme. Society *may* do for itself all that it is *desirable* should be done, and all that *can* be done. Its *wants* and *powers* are the only limits of its rights. The individual can set up no barrier against society. However great the rights of one member, the aggregate rights of all members must be greater. We can not prevent the amount from being larger than any one of the sums which go to compose it, how large soever this may be. The prosperity of a single person can not be allowed to straiten the interests of all,—the general prosperity, so long as this common weal is the very trunk that bears as branches every private good. Society, then, in deciding on its joint action, has only to consider what is truly serviceable to itself, and within the scope of its means. The ancients, Greek and Roman, were not at fault in bowing the individual to the state, but only in their judgment of what the state itself requires.

At this point, important limits have been developed by the experience and discoveries of later times. The first of these is a clear apprehension that the welfare of the state includes that of each citizen ; that the liberty of the citizen can not be trespassed on and the general weal be preserved. It is, then, not by opposed, but by included claims ; not by separate, but by joint rights ; not as a single person, but as one of the many whose well-being is under discussion, that the liberty of the citizen sets limits to civil law. It is seen to be the office of civil law to nurse liberty, not to crush it ; to secure the aggregate good though the good of each part, and to find in the limits of individual prosperity the limits of the common weal. This greater identification of public with private interests, this recognition of the representative power of each citizen by which he stands a type of every other citizen, and thus of the state itself, presents the first great restriction on the arbitrary action of society. Tyrannical enactments, violent interference, vexatious regulations, a substitution of joint action for individual enterprise, have been discovered not to be serviceable to the community, because not so generally to the parties of which it is composed. It has thus become more and more the purpose of the state to establish limits around its citizens which shall furnish the most protection and the least restraint ; and this, not because it does not dare to draw nearer individual liberty, but because it can not otherwise conserve the general liberty. All that enervates the citizen, enervates the state, and therefore the highest individual freedom and responsibility compatible with general advancement should be the law of action to the state. This principle will prescribe different statutes at different times. More can be trusted at one time and to one type of national character, than at another time and to another type. Not to let the individual citizen do what he can well do, is unnecessary interference—is tyranny ; to leave with him what ought to be done, and what he can not or will not do, is inexcusable negligence—is imbecility.

A second limitation of civil law, increasingly comprehended as the years advance, is that imposed by the presence of natural laws covering the field of proposed legisla-

tion. The work which positive provisions have to do, is not so great as it was once thought to be. Not quite every thing in society is dependent on civil law. There are natural forces, inherent motives which take adequate care of very many interests. It is not surprising that before these natural laws,—this legislation of God—was well understood, it should have been frequently over-lapped and set aside by human enactments. Nor surprising, that as men caught a glimpse of this imperturbable and inevitable movement of inherent forces that they should cry "*Laisser-faire*." Slack your ropes, and give the good ship to the gales.

It is only surprising that legislators should so long and so obstinately continue to thrust their positive enactments in the teeth of natural law, to the vexation and discomfiture of the very interests they strive to protect. We may bridge rivers and slightly shift their currents, but for the most part, we contend with deep running water to no purpose. It steals under and around and over our barriers, and at length engulfs them. "Where does the inevitable flow lie?" is the first question of practical engineering; "What and how great the natural forces at work?" the first inquiry of the legislator. Thus only is he prepared to see how far any modification of them is either desirable or possible. To continue, through sheer ignorance or perversity, to walk in the track of natural law, is to wait a lift from the cow-catcher when the train shall sweep along. Many a nation has thus been landed by futile protection in a general paralysis of industry, or the quagmire of bankruptcy by an unsound currency.

A third limitation to civil enactments is presented by man's moral nature. This is one whose existence men have only learned by the most painful and protracted experience. Purely moral results have been all along in the world's history sought, not by civil means merely, for thus they may be, but by some form or other of coercion. This limitation closely allies itself to the last, as resting on the same principle. In each case there is needed on the part of the legislator better knowledge of the forces with which he is dealing, and of the means capable of reaching the proposed end. He is to cease

from the folly of striving to baffle the laws of nature, or the laws of mind, with the idle or the wicked necromancy of a civil process. Convictions are not the fruits of scourging, nor the offspring of legal liabilities. Moral growth is the result of the even, mild, self-balanced action of moral forces ; and we might as well strive to force the fruitage of a tree by increasing heat, while withholding light, as to compel the fruitage of the soul by adding to the cogency of motives while leaving the intellectual grounds of action the same. Civil law has at length been taught, by the many failures of the past, by the long catalogue of crimes wrought in its name, that moral ends must be compassed in conformity with moral law ; that is, indirectly, by a readjustment of the inducements and grounds of action, and not directly, by terror and constraint. This limitation does not exclude legislation in reference to moral ends ; it only restricts it in form. The conditions under which the moral problems of any society are solved, may be, nay, must be, constantly affected by the legislation there in force.

From these three limitations of civil law : that it is to be kept aloof from the liberty of the citizen, aloof from the province of natural law, aloof from that of moral forces, there arises the sound, practical precept, that legislation is to confine itself to certain specified and common interests, those involving rights of property, personal rights, and the conditions of its own preservation and growth ; and that within these fields it is to do no more than clear, well-established public interests require.

Let us glance at some of the directions in which the reformatory power of legislation may, under these general restrictions, be employed.

The line of action, in which the reformatory spirit has been at work the longest on civil institutions, and, as yet, with only partial success, is that of securing a perfect recognition, in the organic law, of the equality of citizens. A part of the community, assuming to themselves superior rights, have frequently withheld a portion of liberty from the remainder, and thus subverted the very foundations of social order. The fundamental axioms of a just government ; that

to each member of the community belong the rights of all, that there are no inherent civil distinctions between citizens, and that all subjects are citizens under those common and uniform restrictions that the public safety requires, have obtained possession of the public mind very slowly, leaving still much call for labor, before the solid rock of natural justice shall be laid bare, and the foundations of government be universally placed thereon. We have just escaped, in slavery, the most violent perversion of these primary rights of man, and are again busy in the discussion of a kindred question—the extension of suffrage to women. In both instances, a portion of the community have, of their own will, fixed the status of the remainder, and alleged a natural law in defense of their action. It is always a position most perilous to pure justice, when a part of the community ventures to pronounce on the rights of the remainder, and that, too, when concession involves an abridgement of their own privileges. Then, if ever, the spirit of reform should be present, to commend justice and philanthropy.

This first work accomplished, of including in the organic law the highest liberty of all consistent with the public safety, there arises a second class of measures, essentially progressive, and therefore reformatory in their purpose.

A wise and liberal government is not content in providing for its safety in a negative way, removing manifest dangers merely. It feels that there is a safe, desirable, positive work for it to do—a work not otherwise to be accomplished, which compacts and strengthens the community and gives it the conditions of growth and power. To these protective, yet more positive functions of government, belong the furnishing of a sound currency, the opening and maintaining of highways by land and by water, the furnishing of postal-service, and, yet more, a free and adequate provision for public education.

That these most important labors of society may be performed in the best and most efficient way, and thus provision be made not so much for present existence as for constant and increasing growth, evidently calls for wise and patient thought, and will long give the reformer subjects for con-

sideration and labor. Education especially is a point at which government seems to depart the farthest from the limited field sometimes assigned it, yet most benignly and advantageously. We especially have gone very far in this direction, striving to add to general education facilities for peculiar training in some of the arts, as in agriculture and branches of mechanical labor. We have striven also to meet abnormal states of mind and body with apt conditions and peculiar discipline, thus providing reform schools, schools for idiots, asylums for the insane, the blind, the deaf and dumb. In no action does society assume a more parental, powerful and humane attitude than in thus gathering up and watching over the weak ones of its fold. Partial, indeed, must be that estimate of the functions of government which would withdraw it from this the most ameliorating and enlightened of its labors.

Yet law does occasionally transcend its appropriate limits in this its oversight of the general good. Protection, technically so called, is an obvious infringement of the limitation of natural law. We find fault with it, not so much for the end it proposes as for its inability successfully to reach that end, and the infatuation with which it struggles against the powerful natural laws which clutch and baffle it. It is indeed an attempt to meet and arrest the whole flow of commercial law, and that, not in behalf of a moral, but of a commercial end. It would supercede by direct civil provision the fundamental principle of trade, a free market, and hopes to do this successfully and advantageously.

Such an effort at once brings into play subtle compensations that over-reach and under-reach and out-reach the law, rob it of its expected gains, and leave, as the last fruit of its labors, that uncertainty, discouragement and paralysis of production which are sure to follow a subversion of its settled and fundamental conditions. It is not admissible to dwell on these compensations. We merely mention a few of them. The increased burdens inevitably thrown on unprotected branches of industry ; the unforeseen effects of fluctuating and suddenly enhanced prices ; the hasty and precipitate way in which branches of business are warmed into life ; the chronic

weaknesses thus entailed upon them ; political clamor among manufacturers, taking the place of private enterprise ; and an uneasy and unindustrial feeling spread abroad that a fortune can be compassed by legislation instead of by labor.

A last class of reformatory enactments are those made in part, at least, in defense of moral interests. More and more is there wrapped up in the civil aims of legislation a moral purpose. This is seen in the penalties inflicted, and in the manner of their infliction ; in the efforts made to reduce the motives to crime and to reform the criminal ; and in the protection thrown around the family, around the marriage relation, around religious liberty. Most just and wise is it that society should exercise this indirect providence over its chief interests. An extreme, yet a just form of this legislation, is that in behalf of the Sabbath. Though to secure a religious observance of the Sabbath is beyond the range of law, to protect the citizen in such an observance by forbidding every use of public places and roads inconsistent therewith, is a possible, and, within narrow limits, an admissible object of legislation. Yet, as these laws approach so closely the realm of pure morals, and stand on so narrow a civil basis, little is to be hoped from them.

Less extreme are the statutes directed against gambling and prostitution. These vices lie more immediately within the province of law, are a more obvious infringement of social order, and more directly disastrous in their physical consequences. To deny to society the right of protective legislation here, is to make it sharp and eagle-eyed in minor interests, and blind and helpless in its chief concerns. Certainly, there is no right human that can forbid, and no law divine that does forbid, a *use* on the part of society of the *power* it obviously possesses in this direction.

The aid of civil law is invoked, and wisely, we believe, under the principles now laid down, in behalf of minors employed in factories. Against such legislation, it is alleged that the laws of trade have this, like the other relations of the employer and employe, under control, and that it is folly to interfere ; that the general principle of holding legislation aloof from natural law should here be applied. To

this we answer, that the action of natural forces frequently ought to be, and may be, modified in behalf of moral ends; that if strong commercial motives are acting on unwise or unkind parents to induce a disregard of the claims of children, society may wisely step in to maintain those claims. In other words, the common welfare no more allows the authority of the parent to be used to the permanent injury of the child, then it does the strength of that parent to be employed in the coercion or abuse of an adult, and a system of labor that is offering inducements to such injuries is obnoxious to law, on exactly the same grounds as the slave-trade.

The direction of law against usury has not the same grounds. There is no adequate reason for singling out the price for the use of money among all other prices, and fixing it by law. The effort runs so directly across natural law as to make such legislation in a large measure futile, and when not futile, productive of effects the exact reverse of those intended. In the one case, therefore, that of the minor, it is practicable and obligatory upon us to interfere with commercial law; in the other, that of usury, it is not, and each case rests on the nature of the ends to be reached, and of the means at our disposal. General principles do admit as possible and desirable a regulation of commercial action in behalf of social and moral ends. They do not admit, as in an eight-hour law, an effort to peremptorily cut short natural forces, to alter *prices* of labor, without altering the *conditions* out of which that price inevitably springs.

A last illustration under this third class remains to us, and one that has long engaged the public mind—prohibitory liquor laws. These, we think, present one of the clearest cases of the right of society to involve moral ends in civil aims, and protect itself at once from the physical and social and moral consequences of a traffic by making it criminal. In the first place, the proposed legislation lies wholly within the province of law. It pertains to trade and goes not beyond the regulation of trade. Indeed, no new principle is involved in prohibition beyond those necessary for the support of any form of license. A license is a partial suspension of trade, and involves the right, if the case is shown to require it, of a

further suspension, extending to a complete suspension or prohibition of trade. The same power that enables us to limit the trade to A. will enable us to take it from him also.

Not only does the subject-matter of legislation lie wholly within the province of law, prohibition can be adequately maintained on purely civil grounds. In no direction are social order, the public quiet and safety, and individual rights of person and property, more often trespassed on, than in connection with this trade. Its physical consequences are breaches of public order and decency, pauperism and crime. A most lamentable fact is it, if the wife and child of the drunkard must exist in society, robbed of every thing, in perpetual danger even of life, and that society be powerless to cast any adequate protection about them. That view of civil law which takes from it the right of interference in a case like this, puts society in the helpless and absurd position of a spectator in a mob, who may oppose violence to violence, and bear off the victims of violence, but who has no power to disperse the rioters or arrest the ringleaders. Society is thus left to deal with effects, and forbidden access to causes, though these are of a tangible and civil character, and sure to be productive of fresh effects of the same character. It must attend on the unwholesome traffic, keep its purlieus clear of paupers, collar and stalk off its brood of boisterous criminals, but can not meddle with the direct physical sources of these evils, the responsible, central agents of these wrongs. There is no rational view of the office of civil law which can so restrict its power, which can put the quiet, the safety, the property, the happiness and morality of the community at the mercy of unprincipled commerce, bending all rights, the dearest and highest, to the one right of trade. Men may traffic and only traffic as they respect those weightier interests of citizens, whose guardian deity, in her regal legislative and judicial robes, is the grave and searching spirit of civil law, overlooking the community, to strike down, not merely the thief whom all are pursuing, but every direct and detrimental offender against the public prosperity.

Now, the high, the moral ends which are incident to such

legislation, certainly do not render it unfit, certainly add to its fitness. Well may society do what it can in so defining the conditions of traffic as to make them as favorable as possible to public virtue. Nor is there any law of nature, rendering the successful execution of such statutes impossible. The only barrier to them is that always presented by crime, powerful in itself and in the favor of parties refusing to recognize its true character.

We accept then this legislation as justified by its subject, by the kind and degree of the evils it seeks to remedy, and by its mode of prevention. A public sentiment that will not sustain it, may render it nugatory, and, therefore, for the time being, unsuitable, but this fact does not remove it from the class of laws justly aimed at as a later condition of the public welfare.

The conclusions we have reached are briefly these : Moral order is the only perfect and possible order of society. Society may do for itself by direct legislative action all that it is intrinsically desirable should be done, and that can be done. The three considerations that especially guide and set limits to this power, are the liberty of the individual, natural law, and moral law. These all demand consideration, and to neglect them is to fail of the end aimed at.

The three directions in which reform, under these restrictions, invokes the aid of law, are first in conforming the organic law of the state to the general principle of equal rights ; second, in completing those measures by which society provides for its safety, prosperity and growth ; and third, in giving the best civil conditions to the moral action and life of the citizen.

ARTICLE III.—THE "SOCIAL CONTRACT" AND MAINE'S
ANCIENT LAW.*

By E. H. GILLETT, D.D., Professor in University of the City of New York.

TO MANY minds there is a strange fascination in those studies which carry us back to periods that antedate historic records, and bring us face to face with objects, events, or institutions which passed away before a written memorial of them was possible. The mute fossil comes forth from its rocky sepulchre, where it has been entombed for ages in silence and darkness, to make its startling revelation of forms of life and conditions of existence as marvelous to us as if they had belonged to some distant planet. The very words we use in our daily speech, become compact volumes of antique lore, when subjected to the tests which comparative philology has learned to apply, and unfold to our view modes of thought and social relations of which we find scarcely a trace in the oldest human records. It is thus that we are enabled to travel back in thought to the infancy of the race, to trace the rudimental forms of speech, to discern national affinities between the peoples of widely separated lands, and to establish important facts in their history with a certainty that belongs only to veracious and imperishable records. Nay, we may even pass beyond the date of human existence on this planet, and picture to our minds a state of things more wonderful than ancient fable ever feigned, when an infinite Providence by gigantic forces was preparing the world for the habitation of man.

But human institutions are often the records—sometimes fossilized—of ages of which written history has left no trace. They too have a marvelous tale to unfold. Traced back to their original by a sagacity and skill like those which have extended their meaning from the fossil stone, or the metamorphosed forms

* ANCIENT LAW. In connection with the Early History of Society, and its Relation to Modern Ideas. By HENRY SUMNER MAINE, Member of the Supreme Council of India, and Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Cambridge. With an introduction by THEO. W. DWIGHT, L.L.D., Professor of Municipal Law, Columbia College. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co. One vol. crown 8vo.

of human speech, they reveal to us the usages and conditions of primitive society, and the successive stages of national development. What Sir Roderick Muchison and Lyell have done for Geology, and Max Müller and other comparative philologists have done for the Science of Language, has been essayed in the sphere of legal institutions, by one worthy to be ranked with them for enthusiasm and success in a favorite pursuit, Mr. Maine, in his "Ancient Law."

It is a curious fact that over the field which he has explored, and from which he has drawn the conclusions in regard to the origin of government which are embodied in his work, opposing parties have passed and repassed in controversial strife, each assuming that its own theory accorded with, and was based upon all ascertainable facts. He comes after them, and shows beyond the possibility of question that both were wrong, or at least that neither did more than merely approximate to truth. Meanwhile the respective theories have had their day, have impressed themselves on legislation and social philosophy, have moulded states, or determined the conditions of political development, while opposing parties, and sometimes opposing armies, have been marshalled under their banners.

With the new political life and energy developed in connection with the revival of learning and the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, the popular elements of the state began to assert their importance in a manner hitherto unprecedented. Among Protestant nations, Papal supremacy no longer held in check the royal power. Thus at the same moment two antagonistic forces were brought face to face. In England for generations no king had attained a power so despotic as that of Henry VIII., especially after the statute of *Præmunire* had fortified his throne against Papal aggression. Never before had the popular consciousness of power and right been so clear and strong; and to us, with an *a posteriori* experience, it seems too evident to admit of question that an ultimate collision of the two forces was inevitable. To some extent an analogous condition of things existed in other countries, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant; but before the sword could be unsheathed for

final arbitrament, the pen must be called into requisition, and the field occupied by disputing casuists.

The Divine right of kings was the logical stronghold of one party, to which they were forced to betake themselves, although the conflict was protracted through generations, before the necessity of such an entrenchment was fairly confessed. The position which the other was constrained to take—speaking in the name of popular rights and protesting against the assumptions of unlimited or despotic power—was at last that of the social contract by which rulers and subjects were mutually bound—the violation of that contract, by the despotism of the monarch, virtually releasing the people from the bond of allegiance, and reducing society to a state of nature, in which its rights might be resumed.

But here also the position finally taken was not at first defined. The assertion of popular rights was rather instinctive than philosophical. Natural feeling impelled men to conclusions which it was left to a more tardy logic to shape into symmetrical forms and theoretic consistency. Neither side comprehended fully what was implied in the attitude it assumed, but the growing consciousness of each arrived at about the same date at the stage of a ripe development. Buchanan had scarcely enunciated his theory of the Social Contract, before the Metropolitan of England, preparing the way for Laud, had grounded the claims of monarchy on Divine right. No wonder that James I. should appreciate highly his transfer from a position where he had Buchanan for a tutor, to one in which a fulsome and even blasphemous flattery could dare to suggest that his majesty spoke by a special divine inspiration.

As early as 1540, a commission named by Henry VIII., and embracing in it several bishops, Cranmer and Ridley among them, drew up a declaration of Christian doctrine *for the necessary erudition of a Christian man*, in which they asserted, "Subjects be bound not to withdraw their fealty, truth, love and obedience toward their princes, *for any cause whatsoever it be.*" They rested content however with basing the duty on the simple scriptural injunction that government, as God's ordinance, was not to be resisted. Beyond this they did not deem it necessary to go.

The haughty spirit of Queen Elizabeth was not predisposed to popular concession. But the force of circumstances compelled her to a policy not altogether in harmony with the spirit of Tudor rule. The revolt of the Netherlands against the power of Spain, was, in itself considered, utterly distasteful to her. But by her very tenure of the throne, she was made the protectress of the revolted colonies. In 1586, Bishop Bilson published his book, of "The True Difference between Christian Subjection and unchristian Rebellion." The book was written by the direction, and with the sanction of the Queen, who in assisting the Low Countries was defending her own throne. It will suffice to indicate the ground which the Bishop took to quote the language of Charles the First in reply to Alexander Henderson: "For Bilson, I remember well what opinion the king my father had of him for these opinions, and how he shewed him some favor in the hope of his recantations, . . . but whether he did (recant) or not I cannot say."

It was in such circumstances as these, when even Queen Elizabeth was reluctantly compelled to admit that—elsewhere at least—subjects *might* be justified in resisting their rulers, that George Buchanan, the whole history of his nation familiar to him from careful study, published his memorable and much-abused work, "De Jure Regni apud Scotos." The time had come when some theory of popular rights was demanded to justify conclusions which to many appeared anarchic or insurrectionary. It is scarcely surprising that these conclusions should have been reached by him, or that they should have been tenaciously held. In his own country he had traced the abuses of royal power. He had indignantly witnessed the scandalous policy and proceedings of the Scottish Queen. Several years of his life had been passed on the continent, and then, as a Scottish exile, he had full experience of those hardships, and was witness of those oppressions which sometimes madden loyal hearts to rage. We can scarcely suppose him unfamiliar with the "Franco-Gallia" of Francis Hottinger, or the "Vindiciæ Contra Tyrannos," commonly ascribed to Hubert Languet, the friend of Sir Philip Sidney. The last had asserted (1579) that kings,

trampling on their subjects' privileges, might be deposed by the states of their kingdoms. He had represented them as feudally vassals of their subjects, and by their injustice liable to the forfeiture of their crown.

Nearly twenty years earlier, kindred sentiments had been penned, though not published, by a young friend of Montaigne, whom the latter pronounces the greatest man of his age, Stephen de la Boetie. With a glowing indignation he portrays the injustice of the assumption that to any one man the rights and life of another should be subject. Buchanan's residence in France doubtless brought him into direct contact with the views of men like these, views which must have seemed to him so pertinent and just, with the history of his native land fresh in memory.

But he had already been prepared by other influences to entertain opinions commended by the noblest spirits of his time. He had himself been the pupil of John Mair, better known by his Latin name, Major. The latter was professor of Philosophy at St. Andrews, and his political sentiments had been derived from the study of the writings of John Gerson and Cardinal D'Ailly. The ground which these famous writers had taken with respect to the relation of Popes and General Councils, Major had taken as to the relation of rulers and subjects. Kings, he maintained, were but the servants of the people, from whom they derived their authority, and to whom they were answerable for every public act they performed. By the popular voice their tyranny might be controlled, and tyrants of all grades might be judicially deposed and condemned.

Such seed-thoughts cast into the young mind of Buchanan, were planted in a genial soil. The time came when they bore fruit in the famous work *De Jure Regni*—a work in which, says Sir James Macintosh, "the principles of popular politics and the maxims of a free government, are delivered with a precision, and enforced with an energy, which no former age had equalled, and no succeeding has surpassed."

It was a bold act which inscribed this treatise to the young monarch, describing it "not only as an advice, but even as an importunate and somewhat impudent exhorter, to

direct you, at this critical period of life, safely past the dangerous rocks of adulation." One cannot help regretting the perversity which rejected the advice, while it resented the avowed impudence.

The substance of Buchanan's views, the distinctly developed theory of the Social Contract, is presented in the following extract from his work, which takes the form of dialogue :

"Is there then," says one of the interlocutors, "a mutual compact between the king and the people?" M. Thus it seems. B. Does not he who first violates the compact, and does any thing against his own stipulations, break his own agreement? H. He does. B. If then the bond which attached the king to the people is broken, all rights he derived from the agreement are forfeited? M. They are forfeited. B. And he who was mutually bound becomes as free as before the agreement? M. He has the same rights and the same freedom as he had before. B. But if a king should do things tending to the dissolution of human society, for the preservation of which he has been made, what name should we give him? M. We should call him a tyrant. B. But a tyrant not only possesses no just authority over his people, but is their enemy. M. He is surely their enemy. B. Is there not a just cause of war against an enemy who has inflicted heavy and intolerable injuries upon us? M. There is. B. What is the nature of a war against the enemy of all mankind, that is, against a tyrant? M. None can be more just. B. Is it not lawful, in a war justly commenced, not only for the whole people, but for any single person, to kill an enemy? M. It must be confessed. B. What, then, shall we say of a tyrant, a public enemy, with whom all good men are in eternal warfare? May not any one of all mankind inflict on him every penalty of war? M. I observe that all nations have been of that opinion; for Theba is extolled for having killed her husband, and Timoleon for his brother's, and Cassius for his son's death."

We have seen that Buchanan did not stand altogether alone in his views of popular rights, but no other writer had given such a definite philosophical shape to the theory of resistance to unjust rulers, yet ere long England was to furnish a fit successor to Bilson. In 1594, Richard Hooker, the *Judicious*, as he is called, published his work on Ecclesiastical Polity. In this he presented views which accorded to a considerable extent with those of Buchanan. His poetical description, rather than definition of law is well known, and has become classic in our language. It suggests the enthusiasm with which he devoted himself to

the study of the fundamental principles of government, and it is not a little curious that with a Puritan for his antagonist, he yet distinctly plants himself on the ground of implied contract between rulers and subjects. So objectionable are his doctrines to the author of "The History of Passive Obedience," (Amsterdam, 1689,) that the latter ascribes them to Hooker's study of the Schoolmen, "who had brought in the terms and notions of the Aristotelian Philosophy into the Christian church, while Aristotle is known to be a great lover of Democracy."

It would require a bibliographical treatise merely to specify the publications, which, during the century that intervened between the publication of Buchanan's treatise and the "glorious Revolution" of 1688, were devoted on the one side to the claims of rulers by divine right, and on the other to the interests of popular government. We can only glance at some of the more noted which attracted general attention. In 1610, Bishop Carlton, in his "Jurisdiction of Princes," expressly repudiated the idea "that the power of Government by the law of Nature is in the multitude." Bishop Andrews, at about the same date, declared "Kings are the Lord's Anointed." Dr. Hakewell in his *Scutum Regis*, 1613, contended that to make insurrections against kings, is, "with the Giants, to make war against God." Bishop Hall contended that "God hath ordained kingly sovereignty," and that "kings and princes hold their crowns and sceptres in fee from the God of Heaven." Bishop Sanderson would not allow a subject to take up arms against his king "not for the maintenance of the lives and liberties either of ourselves or others, nor for the defense of religion, nor for the preservation of a church or state, no, nor yet if that could be imagined possible, for the salvation of a soul, no, not for the redemption of the whole world."

Such were the sentiments which found expression in the pulpits and universities of England, under the reign of a monarch who asserted of the dignity of kings, that they "sit in the throne of God, and therefore are in Scripture termed Gods." Even before his accession to the English throne, William Barclay, in reply to Buchanan, had published (1600),

his work "*De Regno et Regali*," in answer to Buchanan. Lord Bacon's great name must be added to the list of those who exaggerated the power of rulers. "Kings are mortal Gods on earth." Sir Walter Raleigh drifted in the same direction, for the divine rights of kings was then (1602) "in the air." Even John Selden, with all his better sympathies, adopted Sir Robert Filmer's views of Patriarchal authority.

It was impossible to maintain in its unqualified form, the theory of the divine right of kings, with such practical comments upon it as were afforded by the oppressive measures of James I. and Charles I., without provoking vigorous opposition. That opposition was displayed on the assembling of the Long Parliament in 1640. A debt of popular indignation that for a whole generation had been accumulating at compound interest was to be discharged. The civil war was preceded by a war of pamphlets, and vigorous parliamentary discussions, memorable among which are the able constitutional arguments of that great statesman, John Pym, the Edmund Burke of his generation. At first the friends of the Parliamentary interest, as well as those of the king, were content to republish the works that had already appeared in defense of their respective positions. Treatises that had slept neglected for many years were now reprinted, and old antagonists met again in posthumous conflict.

But this state of things could not last long. The crisis demanded fresh pens. The ablest writers of the day came forward to vindicate the parties to which they respectively adhered. Pamphlets of all sorts and sizes issued in alarming numbers from the press. Among their authors were men like Dr. Ferne, Bishop Hall, John Milton, John Goodwin and John Lilburne.

Among them also were two anonymous writers whose pamphlets were to be reprinted for effective service at a later date. One of these was a Puritan clergyman, Philip Hunton, who entered the lists against the Royalist champion, Dr. Ferne. As his pamphlet (1642) was republished without his name, it was subsequently referred to simply by its title, "*A Treatise of Monarchy*; containing two parts. I. Concerning

Monarchy in general. II. Concerning this Particular Monarchy, wherein all the Main Questions occurrent in both, are stated, disputed and determined. By an Earnest Desirer of his country's peace."

This pamphlet is remarkable as defining, with unprecedented exactness, the peculiar features of the English constitution. It held an even balance between the extremes of Democratic rule and arbitrary power. In it we find traces also, distinct though infrequent, of the Social Contract theory. The author answers the inquiry how far subjection is due to magistrates, by saying :

"As far as they are God's ordinance, as far as they are a power, and they are a power as far as the contract fundamental, from which under God their authority is derived, doth extend ! p. 14.

Again, the theory which underlies his speculations is manifest where he says :

"Thus the community whose consent establishes a power over them cannot be said universally to have an eminency of power above that which they constitute ; sometime they have, sometimes they have not ; and to judge when they have, when not, respect must be had to the original contracts and fundamental constitution of that state. If they have constituted a monarchy, that is, invested one man with a sovereignty of power, and subjected all the rest to him ; then it were unreasonable to say, they yet have it in themselves, or have power of recalling that supremacy which by oath and contract they themselves transferred to another."—p. 16.

Again he remarks,

Government "is constituted, and draws its force and right from the consent and choice of that community over which it swayeth.

My reason is, because man being a voluntary agent, and subjection being a moral act, it doth essentially depend on consent."—p. 19.

To this pamphlet an anonymous reply appeared, and this also in the quarto form. Its real author was Sir Robert Filmer, and, when more than thirty years later it was republished with his other works, its authorship was avowed. He denies one of Hunton's fundamental positions, that a monarchy may be limited, or that the people can have any control over a king who rules by a divine authority transmitted from Adam in a patriarchal line.

Blakey, in his *History of Political Literature*, following Hallam, speaks of Filmer's "*Patriarcha*" as published in

1680, seemingly unaware, at least not stating that his "Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy" had been printed as early as 1648, or that it was written in reply to Hunton. This however, with several other productions of his pen, was republished in a moderate sized 12mo. in 1679,—antedating by a year his "Patriarcha," but presenting the same views. During the interval between the two editions of Filmer's treatise, Hobbes had commanded the approval and challenged the applause of many shallow, as well as some able minds. He denied indeed that sovereign power could be limited or divided, but his reverence for divine right in rulers was on a level with his respect for the privileges and powers assured to the people by the Social Contract theory. While borrowing something from each, he yet rejected both.* His scheme, framing government out of the elements of terror and force, represented it as a kind of organized truce between the conflicting forces of a state of nature. The ascendancy of the strongest must be maintained, and his power sustained by the people who unite for their own defense; and conceding that power, it is irrevokable, and indivisible, and uncontrolled. Such was the theory of the Philosopher of Malmsbury, devised for an emergency, and facing two different ways. It might commend itself to the powerful rule of Cromwell, under which it was drawn up, or to the successful attempt of the Stuarts to recover the crown. This was indeed its chief merit, although its essential paganism conferred upon it doubtless a new grace in the eyes of the adventurous or dissolute characters that crowded the court of Charles II. But its popularity was necessarily transient. The world could not long endure it, any more than it could endure that state of things which had given it birth. Again it was seen that for neither of the opposing parties was there any logical resting place, except in one or other of the old theories. The tem-

* It is remarked by Hallam, in his *Literature of Europe*, ii., 139, that Hobbes, "in his notion of patriarchal authority, seems to go as far as Filmer, but more acute than Filmer, perceives that it affords no firm basis for political society." However far he may coincide with Filmer on the *power* of the parent over the child, he is to be credited, not with being a disciple of Filmer, but rather with maintaining the consistency of his own theory in its application to the family. This is however only a subordinate, and by no means a leading feature of his scheme.

porary ascendancy of Hobbes prepared the way for that reaction which floated the new edition of Filmer on the topmost wave of popularity.

"Few political treatises of the date," says Blakely "have undergone such a rigid examination, and have borne such grievous loads of ridicule and banter, as the Patriarcha. It has been handled by all classes of critics—the grave and gay—the loyalist and the republican—the philosophical legislator, and the party pamphleteer. It has been suggestive of some of the best works on government, not only in this country, but likewise on the continent; and it has not altogether lost its influence and interest, even in modern times. The real secret of Filmer's influence arises simply from the fact, that the general argument he undertook to defend was done in a very first rate style. No writer would have managed such materials better.

But with all its ingenuity and its literary merit, Filmer's treatise, like the fly in amber, has been preserved, and attracts still the attention of the curious, mainly because it has become enshrined in the history of the controversy which produced Locke's celebrated *Treatise on Government*. This was published in 1689, immediately after the revolution which placed William III. on the throne. Of that revolution it was the avowed and elaborate defense. The first part of it, in refutation of Filmer, ranks with Chillingworth's celebrated work as an exhaustive argument. It annihilates the very grounds upon which Filmer based his theory, and leaves that theory, like Mahomet's coffin, without foundations, floating between heaven and earth. The second part elaborates the Social Contract theory, as it never had been elaborated before. The origin of government is in the consent of the people, and no power can be assumed over them, which they have not consented to yield.

Locke's essay is open to criticism on many points, but its high merit was that it manfully asserted popular rights, and vindicated that revolution which had restored England to her privileges as a constitutional government. Locke was the philosopher of that revolution; he set forth, and elaborated, though he did not originate, the theory upon which it was justified. That theory was nothing less than the "Social Contract," which Buchanan had defined a century before. On the journals of the House of Commons it took this phase:

"*Resolved*, That King James the 2^d, having indeavoured to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom by breaking the original contract between King and People, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws and having withdrawn himself from this Kingdom, Hath abdicated the Government, and the Throne is thereby Vacant."

Practically this theory had triumphed. The divine right of kings had been refuted by the success of the Revolution as well as by Locke's argument. The Non-Jurors indeed still clung to it. Ridiculous as it appeared in the refutation of Filmer's treatise, it furnished the only logical support for the loyalty which was still extended in some quarters to the exiled Stuart. With the High Church enthusiasm that attended Sacheverell's trial it emerged into temporary notice. The powerful advocacy of Atterbury, as well as some of the Non-Jurors, was put forth in its defense. But the pen that death had wrested from the grasp of Locke was taken up by one not altogether unworthy, whether for his ability or the liberality of his views, to succeed him, Benjamin Hoadly, subsequently Bishop of Bangor.

Hoadly repeated the task that Locke had performed. Like Locke, he borrowed largely from "the judicious" Hooker. He exposed all the plausible phases of the patriarchal scheme, and set forth, with a lucidness peculiar to himself, the harmony between popular rights and the "Social Contract." Like Locke, he would not assert that any such compact was the actual historic basis of government. He contented himself with asserting that the "chief question is not, whether there was ever such a contract formally and actually made; but whether mankind had not a *right* to make it. For if they had, civil government, in the ordinary course of things, could be rightfully founded upon nothing else but this, or what is equivalent to it, a Tacit Consent of the Governed."

Thus, by construction, the theory of the Social Contract had attained the shape in which it existed, when the doctrine of divine right put forth its expiring gasp, or perhaps we should say convulsion, in the Sacheverell excitement. The power and importance of the Non-Jurors steadily declined. The accession of the house of Hanover to the

English throne (1714) extinguished well nigh their last hope. The vigorous, and yet in some respects ludicrous controversy, which followed thirty years later in Scotland, in which Logan, Ruddiman and others figured, can scarce be regarded as galvanizing into transient life the defunct theory of the divine right of kings. Even the tories of the first half of the eighteenth century would have felt insulted if asked to evince their loyalty or consistency by adhering to the principles for which Sir Dudley Digges and Sir Robert Filmer stood ready to draw the sword. The suggestion that Walpole, or even his antagonist Bolingbroke, could defend these principles in the House of Commons excites a smile, and to suppose that Dean Swift was equal to the task is no more than equivalent to supposing that he could write *Gulliver's Travels* as veritable history.

Thus, in the long protracted conflict between two antagonist theories, one had fully triumphed. It had the field altogether to itself. It had won recognition by the Commons of England. It had planted itself firmly in the provisions or defenses of the English constitution. It had engrafted itself upon the political literature of England. It had been enunciated by prelate and philosopher, by statesman and clergyman. With a simplicity that commended it to popular apprehension, and an applicability to the political sphere which made it eminently available under the necessities of controversial debate, it became the test of republican orthodoxy, the high-water mark of whig liberalism.

It is not strange that its influence was felt alike in the old world and the new. It crossed the channel and was greedily accepted by the advanced political theorists of France. It crossed the Atlantic, and shaped the political philosophy of the generation at whose feet Samuel Adams and Benjamin Franklin sat as learners. Rousseau indeed accepted to distort it. He would, in logical consistency with his phase of the theory, make government an utter impossibility. He would have the power of the state to exist only by the unanimous suffrage and consent of every member of which it was composed, and to exist even thus only for the

brief period during which it might be possessed of delegated powers.

It would be a curious, and more perhaps than a mere curious inquiry, how far the theory of the Social Contract was connected with our own and the French Revolution. The use of that theory for the purpose of defining the mutual rights and obligations of rulers and subjects may be fully conceded, without endorsing the false assumptions which it implies. There is no difficulty in supposing a government established by mutual compact, as in the case of the Pilgrims of the Mayflower, and we may reason sometimes most effectively to reliable conclusions when we start from hypothetical positions that are admitted to be possible. But the theory that makes the authority of government depend on an original contract, is encumbered with some grave difficulties. As accepted by our Revolutionary fathers, it implied what they asserted, that all men are created free and equal, even while that equality, in the practical meaning of the word, could not be made to extend to individuals of a single election district of a single colony.

Thus the Social Contract theory is encumbered with the difficulty, that it makes the individual the unit of the state, and yet constructively assumes, what it practically denies, the equality of these units. From this difficulty various mischiefs have already sprung. The French Revolution was the *reductio ad absurdum* of the principles which it avowed, and the theories it embraced. We have run a downward career in the direction of a leveling policy, which reduces all forms of intellectual or personal superiority to the standard of the lowest political attainment. The right of majorities, defended by Locke in his treatise on Government, is but a legitimate inference from his theory of compact, and time is yet to show the vast difference between democracy, truly defined as the rule of all the people, and the ascendancy of a majority trampling on a minority in the mockery of restraint imposed by constitutional checks.

But is the individual the unit of the State? It is a question of fact as well as of theory. We may attempt to constitute it a fact by political constructions, but it does not fol-

low that a partial success justifies the attempt, and we may give the name to the attempt while the reality to which the name answers, is wanting.

It is here that Maine's Ancient Law teaches us to recall and revise the conclusions upon which long accepted and venerable theories have been based. We can not agree with him, as will be obvious from what we have said, when he makes the theory of Hobbes, instead of that of Filmer, the antagonist of that of Locke; and it is only with some qualifications that we should concede his claim that "the Lockeian theory of the origin of Law in a Social Compact scarcely conceals its Roman derivation." But the conclusions which he has reached in his investigation of the *Patria Potestas* of the Romans are fully vindicated by the evidence adduced.

His attention has been specially directed to the study of Roman law from the breadth of the field which it opens, and the means which we have for tracing it back to its original :

"The Roman jurisprudence has the longest known history of any set of human institutions. The character of all the changes which it underwent is tolerably well ascertained. From its commencement to its close it was progressively modified for the better, or for what the authors of the modification conceived to be the better, and the course of improvement was continued through periods at which all the rest of human thought and action materially slackened its pace, and repeatedly threatened to settle down into stagnation."—p. 23.

It is after a broad and careful survey of this field that Mr. Maine sums up his views on the origin of organized society, as follows :

"The effect of the evidence derived from comparative jurisprudence is to establish that view of the primeval condition of the human race which is known as the Patriarchal Theory. There is no doubt, of course, that this theory was originally based on the Scriptural history of the Hebrew patriarchs in Lower Asia ; but, as has been explained already, its connection with Scripture rather militated than otherwise against its reception as a complete theory, since the majority of the inquirers, who till recently addressed themselves with most earnestness to the colligation of social phenomena, were either influenced by the strongest prejudices against Hebrew antiquities, or by the strongest desire to construct their system without the assistance of religious records. Even now there is perhaps a disposition to undervalue these accounts, or rather to decline generalizing from them, as forming part of the traditions of a Semitic people. It is to be noted, however, that the legal testimony comes nearly exclusively from the institutions of societies belonging to the Indo-European stock, the

Romans, Hindoos and Slavonians supplying the greater part of it; and indeed the difficulty, at the present stage of the inquiry, is to know where to stop, to say of what races of men it is *not* allowable to lay down that the society in which they are united was originally organized on the patriarchal model. The brief lineaments of such a society, as collected from the early chapters in Genesis, I need not attempt to depict with any minuteness, both because they are familiar to most of us from our earliest childhood, and because, from the interest once attaching to the controversy which takes its name from the debate between Locke and Filmer, they fill a whole chapter, though not a very profitable one, in English Literature. The points which lie on the surface of the history are these: The eldest male parent—the eldest ascendant—is absolutely supreme in his household. His dominion extends to life and death, and is as unqualified over his children and their houses as over his slaves; indeed the relations of sonship and serfdom appear to differ in little beyond the higher capacity which the child in blood possesses of becoming one day the head of a family himself. The flocks and herds of the children are the flocks and herds of the father, and the possessions of the parent, which he holds in a representative rather than in a proprietary character, are equally divided at his death among his descendants in the first degree, the eldest son sometimes receiving a double share under the name of birthright, but more generally endowed with no hereditary advantage beyond an honorary precedence. A less obvious inference from the scriptural accounts, in that they seem to plant us on the traces of the breach which is first effected in the empire of the parent. The families of Jacob and Esau separate and form two nations; but the families of Jacob's children hold together and become a people. This looks like the immature germ of a state or commonwealth, and of an order of rights superior to the claims of family relation."—p. 118-120.

But, to guard against the error of a too limited definition of the realm over which the *Patria Potestas* extended, he remarks:

"The Family, then, is the type of an archaic society in all the modifications which it was capable of assuming; but the family here spoken of is not exactly the family as understood by a modern. In order to reach the ancient conception we must give to our modern ideas an important extension and an important limitation. We must look on the family as constantly enlarged by the absorption of strangers within its circle, and we must try to regard the fiction of adoption as so closely simulating the reality of kinship that neither law nor opinion makes the slightest difference between a real and an adoptive connection."—p. 128.

The following is what he has to say of the component elements of the Roman State. It is to families, rather than individuals, that the organization of the state adjusts itself:

It is just here that archaic law renders us one of the greatest of its services, and fills up a gap which otherwise could only have been bridged by

conjecture. It is full, in all its provinces, of the clearest indications that society, in primitive times, was not what it is assumed to be at present, a collection of *individuals*. In fact, and in the view of the men who composed it, it was an *aggregation of families*. The contrast may be most forcibly expressed by saying that the *unit* of an ancient society was the family, of a modern society the individual. We must be prepared to find in ancient law all the consequences of this difference. It is so framed as to be adjusted to a system of small independent corporations. It is therefore scanty, because it is supplemented by the despotic commands of the heads of households. It is ceremonious, because the transactions to which it pays regard resemble international concerns much more than the quick play of intercourse between individuals. Above all, it has a peculiarity the full importance of which can not be shown at present. It takes a view of *life* wholly unlike any which appears in developed jurisprudence. Corporations *never die*, and accordingly primitive law considers the entities with which it deals, *i. e.* the patriarchal or family groups, as perpetual and inextinguishable."—p. 121, 122.

Although Mr. Maine's investigations have, for the most part, been drawn from the study of Roman jurisprudence, he fortifies his conclusions by evidence derived from other sources.

"Comparing these Indian successions with some of the ruder social organizations which have survived in Europe almost to our own day, the conclusion suggests itself that when patriarchal power is not only *domestic* but *political*, it is not distributed among all the issue at the parent's death, but is the birthright of the eldest son. The chieftainship of a Highland clan, for example, followed the order of primogeniture. There seems, in truth, to be a form of family dependency still more archaic than any of those which we know from the primitive records of organized civil societies. The Agnatic union of the kindred in ancient Roman law, and a multitude of similar indications, point to a period at which all the ramifying branches of the family tree held together in one organic whole; and it is no presumptuous conjecture that, when the corporation thus formed by the kindred was in itself an independent society, it was governed by the eldest male of the oldest line. It is true that we have no actual knowledge of any such society. Even in the most elementary communities, family organizations, as we know them, are at most *imperia in imperio*. But the position of some of them, of the Celtic clans in particular, was sufficiently near independence within historical times to force on us the conviction that they were once separate *imperia*, and that primogeniture regulated the succession to the chieftainship."—P. 227.

It will thus be seen that more than a century since the theory of the Social Compact had gained the undisputed ascendancy, and nearly two centuries since the Patriarchal theory, long identified with the divine right of kings, had

been contemptuously thrust aside, we are summoned to review the merits of the controversy, and to accept substantially the position maintained by Bishop Carlton in 1610, *viz.*: that "the first government was in a family, and it is absurd to think, and impossible to prove, that the power of government was in the multitude."

It may appear to some merely a matter of literary curiosity that after one of the opposing theories had triumphed in a century struggle with its antagonist, and after it had moulded or modified political theories and entered into the constitution of states, it should be set aside, and made to give place to that antagonist, on the grounds of truth and historic justice. But does it not also suggest, that in basing our modern popular organizations on a theory only partially or constructively true, we may have been doing some things that need to be undone? Is it not obvious that in framing our scheme of the state on a bold individualism, we have been hurried on to some practical conclusions that must eventuate in mischief? The divine right of kings is by no means logically identified with the patriarchal theory. Nay, Locke and Hoadly have both shown that it is actually inconsistent with it. Does it not then suggest, when vindicated from its abuses, the authority inherent in natural and moral superiority, and does it not rebuke that levelling political philosophy which simply polls heads or wills, however ignorant or perverse, in order to ascertain, in the ascendancy of an exclusive majority, wherein the justice or the highest good of all consists?

ART. IV.—CALVINISM IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.*

By W. M. BLACKBURN, D.D., Prof. in Northwestern Theological Seminary.

THERE is a token for good in the popular appreciation of voluminous histories, and especially of extensive monographs upon local subjects and limited periods. The authors of such works have one advantage: they can present a strong array of facts, while they portray the origin and results of great principles. There is range for the graces of scholarship, and the free play of the writer's power to fascinate while he instructs. For illustration, we may refer to the stately histories written by Mr. Froude and Mr. Perry, to which the popular welcome has been deservedly extended. With all this there may be an undue advantage taken of the reader. Space may be given to assumptions and theories on which certain facts are constructed. The partialities and prejudices of the historian may crop out, even when he intends not to be decisive and dogmatic.

The reader of such histories as we have named can scarcely fail to notice the theory, put forth right earnestly, that the "Lutheranism" of the first half of the sixteenth century was a quite pliant and equivocal type of theology, which excluded from its creed and ritual the vital elements of Calvinism; also, that the system of Luther had a normal claim to pre-eminence in England, as more admirably adapted to promote Christian life and worship without dogma. The Lutheran views are declared to be peculiarly identified with those of the Anglican symbols. To this we might not object, were there not manifest a zeal in denying that the Calvinistic views (such as Luther did not reject) had no part, or a merely doubtful part, in these symbols. We think that early Lutheranism is not correctly represented. It is assumed that such

*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. 12 vols., crown 8vo. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1866-1870.

The History of the Church of England, from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A. 3 vols., 8vo. London: 1861-1864.

Anglican fathers as Cranmer, Latimer, and Barnes, "all the government reformers of position and authority," were Lutherans, not simply with respect to the sacraments, but to justification and divine decrees; and that they had no very positive system of doctrine. Mr. Froude speaks of "Latimer, the apostle of the English Reformation," and the martyrs of the time, as having no "'plans of salvation;' no positive system of theology, which it was held a duty to believe; these things were of a later growth, when it became again necessary to clothe the living spirit in a perishable body." "Protestantism, before it became an establishment, was a refusal to live any longer in a lie. It was a falling back upon the undefined untheoretic rules of truth and piety which lay upon the surface of the Bible, and a determination rather to die than to mock with unreality any longer the Almighty Maker of the world." (vol. ii, pp. 44, 77.) The first reformers, then, were not hypocrites.

It is assumed that it was the design and glory of the Anglican Church to occupy a middle place between the mediæval and merely Protestant systems, and carry with her an ambiguous creed; that it is preeminently wise and blissful for a church to have symbols which are capable of two interpretations, and opposite constructions. Mr. Froude asserts that the theory of the Church of England was so to frame its constitution, "that disloyalty alone should exclude a single English subject from its communion who in any true sense could be called a Christian; so to frame its formulas that they might be patient of a Catholic or Protestant interpretation, according to the views of this or that sect of the people; that the Church should profess and teach a uniform doctrine in essentials—as the word was understood by the latitudinarians of the age: while in non-essentials it should contain ambiguous phrases, resembling the many watchwords which divided the world; and thus enable Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist and Zwinglian, to insist each that the Church of England was theirs." (vii, 81, 82.) "The Church of England was a latitudinarian experiment, a contrivance to enable men of opposing creeds to live together without

shedding each other's blood." (x, 108, 109.) Mr. Perry congratulates his Church upon its "conservative character," one "impressed both on theology and ritual." "This, which has been denied to the Presbyterian Reformed Churches, was happily permitted to the Church of England. Reforming slowly and calmly under the shadow of power; not driven in a moment of excitement to cast off everything, and to rush wildly into the extreme most opposite to the old tainted superstition, the divines of the [English] Reformation were able to conserve with a moderation which we can not too much admire." (i, 3, 4.) Perhaps as much calmness and conservatism in the matter of ritual, during the constructive and Puritan times, as are now claimed in the matter of theology, would have been still more admirable to those who grievously suffered on account of rites and robes. The "moderation" was hardly so cool as this assertion of it, and as the assumption that the alleged conservatism was chiefly due to the Anglican temper, and influence of Wittenberg. It is just to say that there may be some ambiguity in these quotations from writers, who plainly hold that the Anglican theology was ambiguously expressed in so happy a way, even in the "articles" of the Church.

The class of such writers is quite large, from the days of Heylin down through the days of Waterland, Kipling, Lawrence, Tomline and Tucker, to our own time; all laboring to prove that the Thirty-nine Articles are not Calvinistic; and all refuted by the historical facts presented in the various special treatises of Hickman, Toplady, Overton, Goode, and Cunningham. But what of it? Why is the matter of much interest to us, on whose consciences the said articles need not press? Because the unity of the Anglican division of the Church with our own in essential doctrine is important and delightful to us, who believe in the communion of saints. Because the true view of any great symbol of faith, which a large and living body of Christians holds in sacred esteem, is of account in history. Because of our interest in the "fathers and founders of the Church of England," from whom we have received a considerable inheritance in doctrine. We read—the mass of our people read—the history and writings of the

early English Reformers and martyrs, and regard ourselves as allied to them in the cause of that One Master who is Christ. And when we are first told that they were Augustinian only in the loosest way of believing, and that they differed essentially from the "fathers" of the Reformed churches of the continent, and yet played with phrases which seemed to indicate an agreement, it appears to us as news quite astounding. They had their errors, and they were growing out of them, but surely they did not study to deceive, professing one thing and meaning another. Their great truths were those which, not only Luther, but also Calvin proclaimed. Neither Calvin, nor Luther, are to us of so much account as are the truth and He in whom it all centres and abides.

By the first named class of writers one is led to suppose that Calvinism was intrusive, and was admitted to a debatable footing in England, at rather a late stage of the Reformation, by means of foreigners, with "the obtrusive letters of Calvin," and the pertinacity of the Marian exiles, who had grown somewhat radical in the bracing air of the Alps. "The Genevan refugees clamored that they had not been consulted," says Mr. Froude, referring to the Elizabethan Liturgy, and quoting from a private and not very clamorous letter of John Jewell, afterwards the good bishop. They "clamored" also "that 'fooleries were made of consequence,' and that 'truth was sacrificed to leaden mediocrity!' At the heart of the matter it was they who were giving importance to what was of no importance; it was they who considered exactness of opinion a necessary condition of Christianity. They would have erected with all their hearts a despotism as hard, as remorseless, as blighting as the Romanist."—(vii. 82).*

* This is overstraining the point, for Jewell wrote not about opinions, but ceremonies, and he was a fair representative of the returned exiles. He wrote of matters which he deemed of very small importance, and which the ritualists greatly magnified. What he really wrote was this: "The scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation; and those very things which you [Peter Martyr] and I have so often laughed at are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons, (for we are not consulted,) as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry. Our minds indeed are not sufficiently disengaged to make these fooleries of much importance. Others are seeking after a *golden*, or, as it rather seems to me, a *leaden* mediocrity, and are crying out that the half

If a vine has grown thriftily in a rugged climate, and borne the finest fruit even amid the brambles that have been gently tolerated, it would be very unjust to cut it down, and then give as a reason that it was illy adapted to the spot where it flourished. "The Calvinistic theology was not a plant suited for English growth," says Mr. Perry, while admitting that "at the beginning of the reign of James [First] it is probable that the tenets of Calvin as to the absolute decrees of God were the popular theology, though not heartily acquiesced in by some of the more learned divines." (i. 21, 22.) Its decline, therefore, in the Anglican Church under the Stuarts, is conveniently explained, not as due to crafty opposition, but simply owing to a want of adaptation! Mr. Froude holds that it had previously shown itself offensive, and quotes a letter of De Silva, the Spanish correspondent, to show "how far less inveterate the Catholics really were against the Lutheran and Anglican theory than against the Calvinists." This might be an honor to Calvinism, which was evidently flourishing in the tenth year of Elizabeth, and the fifteenth of the Articles. It was the "Anglican theory" of rites and robes to which it was so offensive, rather than Anglican theology. But to both Romanist theology and theory of ritual it was no doubt offensive. De Silva, who could not perceive the doctrinal unity of most Protestants, wrote, "Those who call themselves of the religio purissima go on increasing. They are the same as Calvinists, and they are styled Puritans because they allow no ceremonies, nor any forms save those which are authorized by the bare letter of the Gospel. . . . So far as we can see, the majority of Protestants here believe in Calvin. . . . There is a suspicion that a party in the Council would like to bring the Queen over to their views: that so all the Protestants in England might be of one mind. I thought it would be a serious misfortune if these persons were to succeed, and I

is better than the whole." *Zurich Letters, Parker Society*, 2nd series xv. This shows which party made the crying and clamoring, all in rather a despotic way. Moreover, Jewell was more severe upon the "scenic apparatus" than was Calvin, who did not so laugh at it, but conceded a greater amount of tolerance than is usually supposed; and yet there was Calvinism enough to render Jewell a popular bishop in England.

therefore took occasion to warn the Queen of the danger from these libertines. . . . I said, I understood she had been advised to give up the Confession of Augsburg, to which she has professed to adhere, and to take this other form." (Froude, ix. 326, 327.) According to this witness, the majority of English Protestants, in 1568, were Calvinistic, persistently so, rather than Lutheran; they did not adhere to the Augsburg Confession, which some now regard as the advising sister of the English formula of doctrine. Mr. Froude's witness does not help his favorite theory. Elizabeth cared little for any symbol of theology, and De Silva, like the Cardinal of Lorraine in France, was playing off the Augsburg Confession on the pretense that it would be quite acceptable to the papal powers.

Now, we have too high an esteem for the men whom we regard as the fathers of English Protestantism, the founders of the Anglican Church, and the framers of her doctrinal articles, to admit representations which imply that they were double-minded and double-faced, or that they did not speak intelligently, freely, clearly, when they asserted their creed. Shall we charge them with a refined Jesuitism, and with the craftiness of intending to catch men of all opinions? Having refused to "live any longer in a lie," were they guilty of duplicity? Understanding their own views, they meant to be understood. True, they were moderate in expression; they did not enter into minute definitions, but they were definite enough to set forth one theology, and not four beliefs which are supposed to differ.*

* Their honesty will not suffer by the theory that their design was to frame articles in harmony with those of the Reformed Churches of the Continent, embracing what was thought to be important in them all. That they may have advised with Melancthon and Bullinger, and consulted the Confession of Augsburg and the Helvetic Confession, does not prove that they rejected Calvinism. It rather shows that they did not regard it as so sternly dogmatic and extremely exacting as it has been represented. Indeed, Calvin himself, when requested, proposed articles of faith for national churches, whose moderateness upon the "five points" might be used as an argument to show that articles drawn up by him were not Calvinistic. Those English Reformers were not ashamed of their Protestantism. They did not belong to the school of Wolsey and Warham, nor think that Henry the Eighth had perfected England's reformation, so that all that came after was a deformity of the "Anglo-Catholicism" which has been revived in our days, and which disowns the men who were at one with the continental Reformers. Those men may have thought it

Our immediate design is not to set forth the existence and extent of Calvinism among the English Reformers, or in the Thirty-nine Articles; nor to test the precise quality of it, for the fact that every personal opinion of Calvin was not asserted by them is nothing to our purpose. The man Calvin is not the measure by which we judge whether any Christian believers hold to the system which, for convenience, is called by his name, but which existed for ages before he was born. We pity the man who knows the theology of Christ and the Apostles only through Augustine, or Luther, or Calvin; and quite as much pity him who seems to be jealous of their influence upon his mode of thought or his creed. The method employed to show that certain English Reformers ignored Calvinism could be skillfully used to prove that Calvin was not a Calvinist; for he did not expend all his time and energy upon the five peculiar points, nor "unchurch" everybody who failed to see them as clearly as they rose upon his mistless vision. Our purpose is rather to show that Calvinism did not intrude offensively upon English thinking, in the days when men were struggling to know the truth; that it was a growth, and not a mere importation; that it had a normal right to the very foreground of the creed; that, while moderate, it did not disguise its meaning in latitudinarianism; and then to notice some of the attempts to repress it, and some consequences of its repression in the Church of England.

All admit its presence in England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, if not in the time of Edward the Sixth. How came it there? It was there by the presence of the Bible and the writings of Augustine. The light was scarcely breaking when Thomas More was lecturing on Augustine's "City of God" to large audiences. The writings of Luther, circulating quite freely as early as 1520, promoted in the main the same doctrinal system. We are not now concerned with the differences between Luther and Calvin as to the

wiser to reform an old system than to restore the older apostolic one, and hence been unwilling to break away so completely from the Mediæval Church as the continental Protestants were doing; but this does not prove them to have been so latitudinarian as to have had no definite theology.

Lord's Supper and matters of discipline, nor with any strictly liturgical rules. Luther's famous work, "*De Servo Arbitrio*," is proof that he held the doctrines which are usually regarded as peculiarly Calvinistic, sometimes presenting them, says Dr. Cunningham, "with a rashness and offensiveness of statement which can certainly not be paralleled in the works of Calvin himself."

The Augustinianism of the early English Reformers is best established by the memorials they have left. The present century has made public large collections of their letters and treatises. Leigh Richmond edited, in 1807-1812, the "*Fathers of the English Church*;" similar to "*The British Reformers*," republished in this country. The reader of these lives and writings will not doubt that such men as Tyndal, Fryth, Barnes, Lancelot and Ridley, held the theology of Augustine and Calvin. Barnes has been called "a rigid Lutheran;" scores of the Reformed, with even Calvin himself, were once called Lutherans. The rigid Arminian Heylin says of Barnes: "It is no marvel if we find somewhat in his writings agreeable to the palate of the Calvinists and rigid Lutherans," and quotes him on predestination. We can not tithe the evidence on this whole subject. The Parker Society, instituted in 1840, "for the publication of the works of the fathers and early writers of the Reformed English Church," has placed these Reformers in a blaze of light. The letters, crossing each other's lines and weaving a web of history, reveal the private views of many a writer. To these Dr. Bonnet and our Board of Publication have added "*The Letters of Calvin*." Thus one is prepared to correct many a perversion, or garbled extract. For example, the whole of the celebrated letter of Calvin to the Protector Somerset, 22d October, 1548, will give one a far happier impression, than does the compressed quotation on page 103, vol. V. of Mr. Froude.

A glance into these sources of history will show that Calvin had warm friends and close "followers" in England in time sufficient to affect the doctrinal formulas drawn up under Edward Sixth. It is not at all important for us to show that they learned their doctrinal views of him. It is suffi-

cient to know that their theology was in harmony with that of his writings, and that they delighted in his advice. Before the Forty-two Articles were authorized and published in 1553, the year of Edward's death, we find weighty proofs of his influence. In 1549 Richard Hilles, well known among the continental reformers, and one whom Cranmer calls "a merchant, a godly and most trustworthy man," wrote from London to Henry Bullinger: "I hear with pleasure of the agreement between you and Master John Calvin respecting the Sacrament." He refers to the *Consensus Tigurinus*. Many Englishmen shared in this pleasure; another of them was Richard Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, who in 1551 thus wrote to Bullinger, from whom he had been receiving books for two years: "You make me happy with a double present, namely, the Treatise of Master Calvin concerning that most Christian concord established between you in the matter of the Eucharist, and the fifth Decade of your sermons." It should be noticed that Richard Cox had been tutor and almoner of Edward Sixth, whom he carefully instructed in the principles of religion; that he agreed in doctrine with Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, and that he took part in some of those disputations concerning the Lord's Supper, in which the doctrine of Peter Martyr and the Swiss divines prevailed over those of Luther. He was also one of the compilers of king Edward's Liturgy. Hence his interest in the *Consensus*. From this point of view we can understand certain expressions of Bartholomew Traheron, one of the most earnest friends of Calvin, in his letters to Bullinger; "you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans" (Sept. 1548). After the disputation in London, in December 1548, he wrote, "I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism." And yet the Calvinists were not satisfied with the obscurity on this subject in the first Book of Common Prayer, or Edward's Liturgy. Francis Dryander wrote from Cambridge, June 5, 1549, to Bullinger: "A book [of Common Prayer] has now been published, which the English Churches received with the greatest satis-

faction. You will see that the summary of doctrine can not be found fault with, although certain ceremonies are retained which may appear useless, and perhaps hurtful, unless a candid interpretation be put upon them. . . You will also find something to blame in the matter of the Lord's Supper : for the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may attempt to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is, the bishops could not, of a long time, agree among themselves respecting this article." This state of affairs led Peter Martyr also to write to Bullinger, " I congratulate your Churches upon the agreement (*Consensus*) among your ministers." Doubtless he hoped to see the day when the Anglican Liturgy would be in harmony with it. Was not the day coming when Richard Cox would urge the very change which was effected. We might quote other letters—that of the Puritan Hooper among them—attesting that the minds of Englishmen were prepared for the *Consensus*, and hailed it with delight. That famous document was due to Calvin, and its acceptance by the pastors of Zurich was to him a token of the great union of all Protestants which he was anxious to promote. Did it not have its influence upon the revised Liturgy as put forth in the time of Elizabeth?—The agreement is evident.

In 1552 Traheron wrote from London to Bullinger : " I am exceedingly desirous to know what you and the other very learned men at Zurich think respecting the predestination and providence of God. If you ask the reason, there are certain individuals here who lived among you some time, and who assert that you lean too much to Melancthon's views. But the greater number among us, of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin, as being perspicuous, and most agreeable to Holy Scripture. And we truly thank God that that excellent treatise of the very learned and excellent John Calvin against Pighius and one George Siculus [*De Æterna Dei Prædestinatione*] should have come forth at the very time when the question began to be agitated among us. For we confess that he has thrown much light upon the subject, or rather so handled it, as that we have never before seen anything more learned

or more plain. . . . We certainly hope that you differ, in no respect, from his excellent and most learned opinion." Bullinger's view was not quite satisfactory to his friend, who thus wrote to the Genevan Reformer: "I am now learning by experience, most accomplished Calvin, that whatever men may have proposed or determined, nevertheless every event is dependent upon the will of God." From other letters of more eminent men—such as Bucer, who was in the chair of divinity at Cambridge through Calvin's influence, and Archbishop Cranmer, who urged Calvin to come to England with other Reformers, and unite in a great Council for securing unity of Protestant doctrine—we see the way opened for him to tender most freely his advice.

Those "obtrusive letters of Calvin!" In that one to Protector Somerset, 1548, he says: "I do not mean to pronounce what doctrine ought to have place. Rather do I offer thanks to God for his goodness, that after having enlightened you in the pure knowledge of Himself, He has given you wisdom and discretion to take measures that His pure truth may be preached. Praise be to God, you have not to learn what is the true faith of Christians, and the doctrine which they ought to hold, seeing that by your means the true purity of the faith has been restored." Perhaps he takes it for granted that "Calvinism" is well understood by the English Reformers! He then adds a specimen of its more practical points, simply setting forth those doctrines which are called "evangelical" by all who heartily accept the gospel. Not a word about predestination! That theme is very rarely found in his letters. From them one would take him to have been a moderate Calvinist! And again to Somerset, to Edward Sixth, to Cranmer, to Lord Grey, to Sir John Cheke, he offers advice and consolation. He urges thorough reform, but he does not dictate a faith; he either assumes that they agree sufficiently with him, or he is very tolerant of their doctrines. In either case he refutes the charge of obtrusiveness. When certain exiles of Mary's reign had serious disagreements concerning matters of surplice and ceremony, they appealed to Calvin, as one who had already been highly esteemed as an adviser. Early in 1555

the thorough reformer, Thomas Sampson, wrote to "Most excellent Calvin," saying: "I entreat you, by Christ our common Saviour, to give your best considerations to these disturbances of ours, and show me how we may best remedy this present evil. I well know how much weight the authority of your letters will have with both parties in the settlement of this dispute." Sampson was, after his return, one of the strong Puritans of Cambridge.

Weightier writings of Calvin had an early circulation in England. It is curious to find in a list of prohibited books in 1542, "The Lytell Tretyse in Frensche of ye Soper of ye Lord, made by Callwyn," and "The Works every one of Callwyn." Were the "Institutes," which at first "looked like only the rough draft of a great design," and any Commentaries, among "the works" proscribed? Such a prohibition may have had some affect until the reign of Edward began. Lawrence, Short and others assert that Calvin's writings were known too late and little to effect the doctrinal formulas. Was the author so reticent as not to "obtrude" a copy of the enlarged "Institutes" upon Cranmer or Sir John Cheke? "We find some of his writings translated into English in 1548, in the June of which year he dedicated to the Protector Somerset his Commentary on First Timothy. The next year part of the "Institutes" was translated and published, and one year later "Calvin's Catechism." Soon afterwards the French preacher, Francis Burgoyne, wrote to Calvin: "The King of England made most courteous inquiry of me concerning your health and ministry. . . . He sufficiently declared, both by his countenance and words, that he takes a great interest in you, and in every thing belonging to you. He declared that Calvin's letter to Somerset—that obtrusive one—was exceedingly gratifying to him. From that time, therefore, I have thought it would be well worth your while. . . . to send him such a letter as would add spurs to a willing horse." The next month Calvin dedicated to king Edward his Commentary on Isaiah.

When Archdean John Philpot, "the best-born gentleman," was under examination previous to his martyrdom in 1555, he defied papal doctors by asking "which of you is able to an-

swer Calvin's Institutes?" One of them replied with slanders upon the theologian of Geneva. "I am sure you blaspheme that godly man," said Philpot, "and that godly Church where he is minister. . . . For in the matter of predestination, he is in no other opinion than all the doctors of the church be who agree with the Scriptures. . . . I allow (acknowledge) the Church of Geneva and the doctrine of the same; for it is *Una Catholica et Apostolica*; and doth follow the doctrine which the apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in king Edward's days was also according to the same." This testimony is the more valuable when it is remembered that Philpot was closely associated in the defense of Calvinistic doctrines with Robert Ferrar, John Bradford, and Rowland Taylor, and in dying for them with some of the noblest men that ever labored to restore to England the theology of the New Testament.

We contend, however, that the Calvinism of the earlier Reformed Church of England was not an importation; it grew up on the soil. The direct influence of Calvin was not the source of it. We might refer to various Anglican formularies, treatises, sermons, and discussions, such as Ponet's Catechism, approved by a large convocation at London, authorized by king Edward and his name given to it, once supposed to have been drawn up by Ridley, who "set his hand to it," subscribed by Cranmer, and published in 1553, with the Forty-two Articles; also it was revised by Dean Nowell, at a later period, and approved by the highest powers. Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio says of it: "This catechism may therefore be received as a most authentic voucher for the doctrines of the Church as understood in the reign of Elizabeth." We may include the reign of Edward. Certainly it teaches strong Calvinism. Also, the "Helvetic Confession," which Strype declares "our Church did then [time of Edward] heartily consent to and own." This confession certainly was used by the framers of the Forty-two Articles. Bishop Grindal wrote to Bullinger, "Down to this very day we do perfectly agree with your Churches and your Confession of Faith." Despite the attempt to render them ambiguous and equivocal, we refer to the doctrinal portions of the

Forty-two Articles whose parentage of the Thirty-nine will not be disputed. Calvin did not object to the theology of those articles. Why cite treatises and sermons, the declarations of those who framed the Articles of doctrine? We may save ourselves the space and trouble by referring to a peculiar Confession issued from the prison of certain Marian martyrs, and Strype shall be our authority.

He says that in 1556, "It was thought fit by the orthodox to write and publish summary confessions of their faith, to leave behind them when they were dead." The prisoner, John Clement, drew up "A Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith. In which it appears the Protestants thought fit (notwithstanding the condemnation and burning of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, Bradford, for heretics) to own their doctrine, as agreeable to the word of God. . . . This Confession may be looked upon as an account of the belief of the professors in those days. Copies thereof were taken, and so dispersed for the use of good men; one whereof is in my hands." It would be hard to find stronger Calvinism than is expressed in this document, in which dying men freely declared their faith, and claimed that it was the system of doctrine approved and taught by the "fathers" of the English Church.

Who framed the original Anglican Articles? Some have thought Cranmer, assisted by Ridley. The first draft (1551) seems not to have been definite upon original sin and predestination; months of consideration were given to the subject. Among other steps taken, it appears that certain articles were submitted to Harley, Bill, Pern, Horn, Grindal, and John Knox; the last three firm Calvinists, whatever the others may have been. What these men suggested we do not learn, but very soon thereafter the Forty-two Articles were authorized by King Edward (1553), who declared that they were "devised and gathered with great study, and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our bishops of this realm and sundry others of our clergy." Mr. Short admits "that there is no historical evidence to confirm an idea not unfrequently entertained, viz., that they were drawn up for the sake of promoting peace and tranquility,

and as a compromise of opinion, rather than a standard of faith." He thinks "disputed points" were left to the judgment of individuals, but no such latitude of interpretation was granted as to allow of two or three theologies utterly at variance. Archbishop Parker, with Bishop Jewell, strong doctrinal Calvinists, had the chief hand in the revision which resulted in the present Thirty-nine Articles; also the brief catechisms in some of the Bibles of the period.

The Calvinism of Edward's time may be determined by the Calvinism of Elizabeth's reign. The two versions of the Articles prove that the doctrine was substantially the same in each period. Mr. Froude says "the Anglican divines had developed into Calvinism" at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. Most of them did not require much development, save in the purgation of the Liturgy, a matter on which Calvin mainly insisted, and whose achievement has been ascribed, in part, to the influence of his letters and treatises; and unquestionably much was due to the efforts of Knox. We have room for a very few, out of many, testimonies. An English translation of the "Institutes," enlarged to the present size, appeared in 1562, and versions of many other of Calvin's works were made in succeeding years. The use of them was strongly approved by such ornaments of the Anglican Church as Bishops Jewell, Grindal, Parkhurst and Cox, such Archbishops as Parker, Hutton and Whitgift, such scholars and teachers as Whitaker and Donne. Indeed, Elizabeth took care to appoint Calvinists to places of episcopal power, and to professorships in the universities. As this did not cause a popular protest, we may infer what was the theology most in demand. When Baro and Barrett, professors at Cambridge, 1595, opposed and "preached against Calvin's doctrine of predestination," they were rather severely taught that "an English University and the Church of England herself were then too hot to hold an Arminian." One result of the agitation about the then new theology, was the famous "Lambeth Articles," which push Calvinism to an extreme. Yet Archbishop Whitgift said, "I know them to be sound doctrines, and uniformly professed in this Church

of England, and agreeable to the articles of religion established by authority."

Even greater care was taken in the universities to teach sound doctrine. The bishops not only "thought fit that ministers should converse in Ponet's Catechism," but they should acquire a more thorough system of theology. Hence they insisted upon the study of Calvin's Institutes, the greatest theological work of the age. And this was no underhand affair. The Romanist Schulting wrote, "In England, Calvin's Book of Institutions is almost preferred to the Bible. The pretended bishops enjoin all ministers to learn the book almost by heart, and never to have it out of their hands. It is placed in the churches, where a lofty part of the pulpit is assigned to it, and it is preserved with as much care as if it was the Sibylline Oracles." Another Romanist, Stapleton, makes a similar statement, adding, that "in both the universities, those who are intended to be theologians are first of all enjoined to peruse these volumes." Dr. Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, ever to be highly esteemed, tells us one reason of his theological attainments: "When I set myself to the study of divinity as my proper business, Calvin's Institutes were recommended to me, as they were generally to all young scholars in those times, as the best and perfectest system of divinity, and the fittest to be laid as a groundwork of that profession." This good bishop was then training for valiant service against the Arminianism which rushed in under James. The "Common Places" of Musculus, "Englised" in 1563, by the master of Merton College, and approved by Archbishop Parker, was another valued text-book of the day. Musculus had been invited to England soon after Edward took the throne, and, declining to go, he then wrote, "I am very much pleased that the pure form of Christianity is daily more and more prevailing in that Kingdom." We may know what he thought was the Anglican theology of Edward's time, when we consider that he was a thorough Calvinist.

In noticing some of the means by which Calvinism was repressed in the Anglican Church, we must touch upon the dresses and the ceremonies which gave so much trouble in Elizabeth's reign. She insisted upon managing the clerical

fashions by law. But laws of conformity and uniformity were of little avail in securing peace. The more courageous Puritans would not *uniform*, although almost every one of them was willing to conform in other respects. They were "eminently provoking," says Mr. Perry. "That sober and pious men should think themselves justified in convulsing, worrying and distracting the young church, struggling towards maturity and strength amidst the greatest obstacles, on the miserable questions of church vestments, or the insignificant matter of the use of the cross in baptism, seems to show a sufficiently bitter and litigious spirit, and with this, in fact, the Puritan clergy are justly chargeable. . . . Doubtless a telling case may be made out by dwelling on the virtues of the non-conformists, and magnifying the severities of the bishops ; but the real point at issue was not a question of conscience, but whether the Puritans should be suffered to hold preferment in the church in open defiance of the requirements of the law." And so they were "eminently provoking !" Yes, yes, and eminently provoked. Why oppress them with laws on matters of indifference ? Why annoy them with those miserable, conscienceless questions ? The insignificance of the ritualistic styles did not give right to mere fashion and force. When Sampson and Humphreys, two of the Oxford inflexibles, were pressed by Archbishop Parker to state why they did not conform, they gave, among other reasons, a bit of their logic : " We ought not to give offense in matters of indifference ; *therefore* (not, we ought to conform, but) the bishops ought not to enforce the habits." This is termed by Mr. Perry "a specimen of extraordinary wrongheadedness." That is, the bishops had a right to enforce what was indifferent, but the clergy had no right to refuse it. If each party had insisted, by argument and law, by threats and deprivation, to dress the other in its own fashion, then both would have stood upon a provoking equality. The world knows that the Puritans saw their grievances increase, until grave matters of truth and conscience drove them out of the Anglican Church. With them went out a large share of the staunchest Calvinism. What remained was put under the ban. The Church was affected by theological

weakness. Ritualism belittles the mind and nurtures a lax theology.

A change was wrought in the universities. Their more thorough reformation dates from the beginning of Edward's reign, and the inauguration of professors whose model was Geneva. Calvin had a hand in securing several of them to those institutions. Among those from the continent were Paul Fagius, and the still more eminent Hebraist, Emmanuel Tremellius, and greater still, the theological professors, Martin Bucer, at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr, at Oxford. The correspondence of these men and their students, with Calvin and other reformers, throws many a fresh ray of light upon the history of Calvinism in England. Mr. Perry says, "a continued succession of divinity professors, of a strong Puritan bias, had made the University of Oxford full of Calvinistic and Puritanical notions." He might have run back the succession to the time when "young Oxford" was unmanageable in its opposition to the divorce business of Henry VIII., who scolded "the youth of the university" for speaking like profound doctors; or, when Tyndale and Tavemer were qualifying to translate and edit the Bible, Fryth and Farrar were acquiring faith for a martyr's crown, Foxe was going deep into history, and Jewell was seeking not the leaden, but the golden mediocrity; times when Wolsey was annoyed because his favorite Oxford was "giving as much trouble as it could, and made a bold struggle for freedom and the rights of conscience." Later still Sampson, Humphreys, Holland, the Abbots, and Reynolds, the prime mover in our authorized English version of the Bible, were remarkably pitted with the "Puritanical disease." Heylin, a man worthy and willing to carry Dr. Laud's nauseating medicine-chest, full of caustic remedies for the ills of the church, lamented the spread of the contagion at Oxford, and wrote "that there was little to be seen in it of the Church of England; all the Calvinian rigors were received as the established doctrine of the church." Calvin, by his reputation in both universities, and by the "extreme diligence of his followers," had produced "a general tendency unto his opinions." He could find but two anti-Calvinists in Oxford, in his time (that of Charles I.), and one

of these has since had his merit to this honor impertinently questioned. Perhaps they had been even more rare in Abbot's time, when "Episcopacy was maintained by halves." The forms and surplice were not appreciated, to the grief of the historian Heylin, who adds: "If any preacher ventured to impugn the Calvinistic dogmatism in the University pulpit, he was censured and inveighed against. Amidst the old Gothic buildings, testifying of Catholic antiquity, you might fancy yourself at Geneva, sitting at the feet of Calvin or Beza." It was really a dreadful time. Primate Bancroft had "no leisure for an assault upon the University." And William Laud, the rising champion, had not yet crushing power in his hands. Even at Oxford he was accused of Romanism! a charge that ever pursued him, and damaged him until it was rather a virtue in the eyes of the First Charles. This man was nurturing and heading a party against the Abbots and their supporters. No other did so much to work a change in the Anglican theology.

Cambridge was by no means free from the "prevailing disease." It had been somewhat in the air of the town ever since Wolsey's reform had proved too weak a thing for certain "anti-church" spirits, who formed "a theological party" of dissenters. Among these "White-Horse divines" were Barnes, Bilney, Latimer, Coverdale, Bradford and Rowland Taylor. These "innovators," as Mr. Blunt names them, did good work, and some of them died for it. Their influence remained, and their University fairly eclipsed Oxford in the learning and renown of its divines, and in the royal favor. Whitgift, Bancroft, Andrewes, Hall, Mede, Davenant, Whitaker, and Overall, were Cambridge men, most of them suspected of "looking too much towards Geneva." When a certain Dr. Carrier "with great virulence fell foul on the memory of Calvin," a chaplain replied: "Your old master, Archbishop Whitgift, was of another mind; laboring always, when any occasion was offered to countenance his own writings with Calvin's authority, and especially out of the book that you most dislike (the Institutes)." It was Davenant who maintained that the Arminian doctrines had been always "censured as erroneous by our Universities and revered bishops."

It was Whitaker who framed the "Lambeth Articles," and he was still there employing his logic to sustain them, and keep tasteful the text-books of Peter Martyr, Calvin and Musculus. It was thought heresy to oppose absolute decrees, or throw doubts upon indefectible grace. The spot still adhered to Cambridge when John Milton entered in 1625. No attention was paid to fasts or festivals. The rubric was very shabbily treated. Extemporaneous prayers were frequent. The students "refused to bow at the name of Jesus, and during the creed turned to the West." Three years later Dr. Samuel Ward wrote: "As for our University, none do patronize these points [of Arminianism] either in the schools, or pulpit. Though, because preferments at Court are conferred on such as incline that way, causeth some to look that way." Altogether affairs were in a state of frightful non-conformity. But the unstylish old mother (not *alma mater*) was nurturing a son who would soon break from the leading-strings and look the way of promotion. John Williams was growing into a friendly rival of Laud, in his aversion to Puritanism, and his ambition for lofty places, although he was never accused of lax doctrine, popery and inquisitorial severity. Able patrons and Court-favorers rapidly pushed these men up the ladder; and when Laud came to wield the argument of law—then more effective than logic—the lights of the Universities began to be dimmed. If anything ever crept, by political craft and wordly worming, into England's Church, Bishoprics, and Universities, it was that system to which Mr. Perry bows, when he says that Arminius died in 1609, "but not before his genius and Christian courage had given form and substance to opinions destined to exercise a powerful influence on the theology of the Church of England, and to emancipate the religious mind of Protestant Christianity from a slavish obedience to the assumptions of Calvinism." Arminius was outdone, and he would have been ashamed of the devices and despotism employed by Laud and his co-laborers. He might have laughed at such talk about "emancipation," for Arminius had commended to his students the Institutes and Commentaries of Calvin in

terms as lofty, and unqualified, as would be safe in regard to any human productions.

As to king James, smattering of theology and boasting of king-craft; dimly perceiving the true principle of toleration and yet scarcely able to tolerate more than one class of opinions at a time; now sending commissioners to the Synod of Dort and rejoicing over the success of Calvinism, and again leaving his son-in-law, the elector Frederick, unaided in the Palatinate, an act which was interpreted as an apostasy from Protestantism and a full surrender of himself to Spain and the Pope; this James the First, who was accused of running through every great system of belief and forming a court infamous for its vices, had something about him to justify Sully in calling him "the wisest fool in Christendom." His grandest work was the formal part taken in the authorized version of the Bible. In view of it we almost forget his course buffoonry and feeble tyranny. His worst act was his betrayal of the doctrinal system to which he owed most, and in which was found the really vigorous theology of the age.

The boldest outrage was committed on pretense of allaying a public excitement. The people and clergy would talk about the massacre of Frederick's Protestants, especially since Archbishop Abbot was disgraced on account of his effort to aid them, and they would complain of the royal cringing to Spain and of the growing favor to Romanists. James must repress this liberty of speech. He issued directions for preachers, setting their limits, and assigning to them their subjects. Three of the orders were, "that no preacher under a bishop or a dean was to preach on subjects not comprehended in the Thirty-nine Articles—that no sermon was to be preached on Sunday afternoons, except on points of the Catechism, and that catechizing was to be preferred to preaching—that no preacher under a bishop or a dean should handle the deep points of election, predestination, reprobation, or the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of grace."

Only a bishop, or a dean, or one higher, should preach on the controverted points of doctrine. Very well; only an Arminian or semi-papist should be a dean, or bishop, or anything lofty enough to qualify him for handling these high

themes! Such was the policy, although it was not thoroughly worked until the next reign. These high officials in the church were not generally disposed to preach upon the subjects allowed only to them, if we may credit Mr. Perry, who says, "The bishops, for the most part, passed their time hanging about court, looking out for preferment, instead of working among their clergy. . . . Men were advanced to the highest posts in the church at the word of a favorite, through an excess of servile adulation, or from a controversial thesis cleverly argued. With the exception of Bishops Andrewes and Morton there were no men of conspicuous merit among the prelates of King James." Neal remarks that, excepting Bishop Andrewes, almost all the practical writers of the time were Puritans, among whom were Gibbs, Preston, Dyke, Willett, Bolton and Byfield. The school of Whitgift had passed away, and the sharp anti-Calvinism of Laud and Montaigne was installing another, very tolerant of lax doctrine and of popery. Calvinism was the greatest bar to influence, or preferment. An anecdote tells the result of the scheme: A country gentleman asked a city chaplain (who grew into Bishop Morley,) "What the Arminians held?" The reply was: "They hold the best bishoprics and deaneries in England."

King Charles I., firm, decided and fixed, where his father had been weak and vacillating, adopted Laud's system, "which regarded the Romish Church with respect, and endeavored to cull out all ancient truth from its corrupted modern teaching; the system which, relying on the authority of the pre-Augustine Fathers, discarded the modern dogmatism of the Calvinists."—(Perry i., 332.) One of the three things in his programme was, "The suppression of the opinions and institutions peculiar to Calvinism." He took earnest care to repress the preaching of it. He soon proclaimed the warning to churchmen, "that neither by writing, preaching, printing, conferences, or otherwise, they raise, publish and maintain any other opinions concerning religion, than such as are clearly warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England." It looked somewhat fair for him to adhere so closely to the constitution, for he is repressing

those who "shall adventure to start any new opinions differing from the sound and orthodox grounds of the religion of the Church of England." But by this time the court bishops had a new mode of adjusting the Thirty-nine Articles to their consciences, if they knew theology enough to comprehend their real intent. They were learning the theory of ambiguity and equivocation. Charles could rely on the prejudices and warping genius of the new school of interpreters. Hence Rushworth asserts that "the effects of this proclamation, however equally soever intended, became the stopping of the Puritans' mouths, and an uncontrollable liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party."

It was nothing for a man to claim that he held strictly to the Articles; he must hold to the Laudian glosses and interpretations, or fall into the hands of the High Commission, and be favored with an inner view of the machinery for persecution. At length, after much censorship of the press, and suppression of books which were not tasteful to the dominant party, a Declaration was prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, setting forth the fact, that all clergymen had signed the Articles, as "an argument to us that they all agree in the true, usual, literal sense" of them, and then declaring the king's will to be "that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises as they be generally set forth in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England, according to them. And that no man, hereafter, shall either print, or preach, or draw the articles aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Articles, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." This verbosity could not hide the real design. Mr. Perry frankly admits that "the intention was plain enough; the policy more questionable. It was intended to restrain the sermons on predestination and election, free and irresistible grace, and all the favorite topics of the Calvinist." If these were favorite topics, to the neglect of the most practical matters of salvation, they were made so very much by the intense zeal to repress them. Mr. Short says of this Decla-

ration, "it is no small proof of the temper of the times that it was deemed to be in favor of the Arminian side of the question, and that the Calvinists were about to petition against it." When Bishop Davenant preached on predestination (*bishops* were permitted under James,) the king was offended, and the preacher was brought before the Council. Although he pleaded that he had acted in accordance with the Declaration, and the royal injunctions, he was severely reprimanded. Certain Oxford preachers were taught the king's meaning by an official ousting, and Fuller says of them: "The expulsion of these preachers expelled not, but increased, the differences in Oxford, which burnt the more for blazing the less; many complaining that the sword of justice did not cut indifferently on both sides, but that it was more penal for some to touch, than for others to break the king's declaration."

Of the history this may suffice. Christendom knows how Laud ruled the king and the Church in matters of religion. The very primacy has a record which tells of a marvelous change, for there had been six primates orthodox, in the main—Cranmer, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Bancroft and Abbot—and who of them ever dreamed of a Laud in their chair? And yet, Cranmer excepted, the world has heard more of Laud than of all the rest, for ambitious tyrants have been published that the nations might be warned. Calvinism did not fail in the Anglican Church from want of adaptation, or earnestness in teaching men how to be saved, or devotedness to the simple doctrine of the cross; nay, its practical spirit was offensive, for the offense of the cross had not ceased. Individuals still clung to it. The Puritans would doubtless have remained in that Church had not the roughest treatment been an invitation for them to leave.

The consequences of throwing Calvinism into the background were serious. The Laudian system almost ruined the English Church by politics, by formalism, by a tendency to papal ceremonies, by magnifying what was little and slurring what was immense, by persecution, by a discipline inimical to learning, and by a theory which despises unity with Protestantism, and makes everything of a sentimental, if not sacramental,

unity with Rome. Those who now do him reverence are those who reject the title of "Protestant," and delight in that of "Catholic," if it only be applied peculiarly to the Roman fold. Mr. Perry is not of this extreme class. He says, "We may admire Laud for his consistency, zeal and firmness, but probably most persons will admit that he was narrow-minded, impolitic and imprudent. . . . A union of the policy and talent of Williams, with the learning and character of Andrewes, might have saved much of the troubles which were already darkly looming in the distance. . . . A policy of repression, coercion and menace was to be tried to the utmost both in Church and State, and its signal and terrible failure to remain a sad warning for all time."—(i., 324.)

The intellectual consequences were humiliating. "In the days of Laud the development of mind was hampered by the civil ascendancy of Churchmen."

The clergy "were too busy and managing, to become a literary class. They may have possessed a respectable amount of professional learning, but only in a few instances did they show a conspicuous excellence." Mr. Perry further says, quoting Burton, that the greater part of Laud's bishops thought it best to confine themselves to articles of inquiry and an occasional sermon in praise of themselves and the king. What a fall! In the days of Edward and Elizabeth the higher clergy had set a noble example of studiousness. They were not intellectual giants, but they did their best in theological scholarship. They held to great doctrines, and wrestled to understand them. Only the highest, holiest truths can give Augustines, Anselms, Calvins, Latimers, or Jewells to a period of the Church. With the theory of the Arminian sense, or the ambiguity of the Articles, came a neglect of clean-cut, definite theology. The "Institutes" and "Common-places" were thrust out of the Universities, and nothing so comprehensive was brought into their place.

Not only the quality but the quantity was effected; little was produced, especially of the popular kind. Bishop Ellicot has recently, in the essays entitled "The Church and the Age," complained of this result. "The truth is," he says, "we have far too much neglected the study of systematic theology in this

country" (England). Pearson and Jackson produced "our two really great dogmatic works. What we have had since their time have been treatises on the Articles of the Church of more or less merit and usefulness," but the writers had not the knowledge of "speculative philosophy" to meet "the difficulties felt by modern thinkers," nor did they attempt to re-arrange the Articles into a systematic form. Indeed, he thinks, the Articles do not furnish a sufficiently broad basis for a complete system of theology. It is gratifying to find a bishop thus strongly favoring "a true and intelligent system of Christian dogmatics," as a want of the age. It is also pleasing to notice that, in the absence of theological and practical writers equal to the "Dissenters" during the seventeenth century, our Anglican friends prize, and sometimes edit, the works of such grand old Puritans and non-conformists as Baxter and Owen, Flavel and Howe. A living Churchman edits the "Complete Works of John Bunyan." Nor do we fail to acknowledge the merits of Donne and Jackson, Bishop Hall, "the English Seneca," and Jeremy Taylor, "the poet of the pulpit." Thus a fraternal correspondence between our ecclesiastical bodies is conducted through the writings of godly men who were too great and good to be limited to any one branch of the truly Catholic Church, and who being dead yet speak, and amid such company we forget the wars of the past.

The tendency to make the Articles and theology of the Anglican Church appear very equivocal was another deplorable consequence. They certainly were not so regarded in the reign of Elizabeth, when Thomas Rogers wrote the only commentary of the time on the Thirty-nine Articles. It was countenanced by Archbishops Whitgift and Bancroft. It offended only papists and anti-prelatists. It was, says Toplady, "perfectly and judiciously Calvinistical from beginning to end." It gave only one sense to the Articles. The Church was happier with a creed which had a definite meaning. But from the days of Laud we have history enough—Mr. Perry gives enough—to show the endless trouble caused by the theory of an equivocal creed. It fosters the notion that two theologies in a Church are better than one, and has led

some to act as if they thought it still better to have no theology at all.

Mr. Perry's volumes are instructive in the record of precedents. In our day and land there is frequently a local agitation about matters of subscription to articles of ritual and of the use of certain forms. Some almost prophesy that these will finally end in a revision of the entire "Book of Common Prayer," or a retirement of the complainants. But all this is only a repetition of the past. Disaffection has been frequent. Petitions for revision and change have been made. Protests have been offered. And yet the Liturgy remains unchanged. It is long since the canonically disobedient have been severely punished; we do not look for severities now against them. There has been no schism on such grounds; we look for no separation of dissenting parties from the Church, which they love, and which most of them regard as in spiritual unity with Protestant Christendom.

ART. V.—THE ORDER OF SALVATION.*

By DIAKONUS SCHRÖDER.

Translated by Rev. G. W. SHELDON, Instructor in the Union
Theological Seminary, N. Y.

[THE Order of Salvation (*Ordo Salutis*, *Heilsordnung*) is founded upon Acts xxvi., 17, 18: "The people . . . unto whom now I send thee" (Calling,) "to open their eyes" (Illumination,) "and to turn them from darkness to light" (Conversion,) "and from the power of Satan unto God" (Regeneration, by which we become sons of God,) "that they may receive forgiveness of sins" (Justification,) "and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Union with Christ through Faith, Sanctification, Preservation in Holiness, and Glorification.)—Hollaz, quoted in Luthardt's *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, §59. 2.—Tr.]

THE SYMBOLICAL DOCTRINE.

Although Evangelical Lutheran Theology was first led, on account of Pietism, to present an exact "Order of Salvation,"

*Ueber die Lehre von der Heilsordnung. Ein kritisch-dogmatischer Versuch, vom Diakonus SCHRÖDER in Urach im Königreich Württemberg.

i. e., a systematic statement of those steps by which the individual is brought to salvation, or to a participation in the kingdom of grace as well as in the kingdom of glory, yet the conception of an Order of Salvation came into existence, necessarily and by name, with Protestantism itself. Of course, the religious development of believers is various, and we must be on our guard against making something that belongs only to a special leading of grace, a general valid type, and so attempting to prescribe methodically to the Holy Spirit an order which he does not follow. We must state those general characteristics which are found everywhere, because they lie in the essence of redeeming grace and of the guilty man to be redeemed. As surely as the Evangelical Church, in its doctrine of Justification, lays down any different way of salvation, as does the Romish Church, e. g., so surely must it teach another order of salvation. For this reason, the germs of the doctrine of the Order of Salvation are contained already in the Symbolical Books.

The passage in these Books which approaches the nearest to what has of late been called the Order of Salvation is, as is known, the exposition in Luther's Shorter Catechism of the Third Article, [of the Apostle's Creed: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church," etc.]: "The Holy Ghost has called me through the Gospel, has illuminated me with his gifts, has sanctified and preserved me in true faith." Here Luther portrays, in the first place, the preparatory work of the Holy Ghost, viz., Calling; then that by which salvation is communicated, a work that is two-fold, consisting of his entrance into the understanding, as Illumination, and into the will, as Sanctification; finally, the carrying on of this work in those who have already been illuminated and sanctified, viz., Preservation in true Faith, and, we may add, in the Sanctification wrought by Faith. There is a single obscurity in the phrase, "in true Faith." Is the meaning that Faith arises from Illumination, and forms only the antecedent of Sanctification, or that Faith arises from Sanctification, since Sanctification has already appeared in the fact that the man has attained unto Faith? Neither of the suppositions

is entirely correct. The phrase is somewhat ambiguous. As Luther once makes a distinction between Illumination of the undertsanding and Sanctification of the will, he can not attribute the source of Faith either to the one or the other, for it belongs to both, since Faith, as the Defense of the Augsburg Confession says, p. 125, is not merely knowledge in the understanding (*notitia in intellectu*) but trust in the will (*fiducia in voluntate*). In his very first negative proposition, he speaks distinctly of the source of Faith: "I believe that not of my own reason or strength can I exercise Faith in Christ Jesus my Lord, or go to him;" while in the second proposition he skilfully pushes in Faith between Illumination and Sanctification, so that, while hanging between them, it is also a bond of union. In reference to the whole symbolic passage it is well to observe that the Catechism does not attempt to describe the development of the state of grace, but the work of the Holy Spirit, and that thus the effects of divine grace, of which it speaks, are to be considered chiefly, not in the passive, but in the active sense, i. e., as the operations of the Holy Spirit, and not as it effects on the hearts of men. Hence the Catechism gives an incomplete Order of Salvation; essential links are wanting, and can be inserted only by doing violence to the definitions of the Catechism. Above all, Justification is lacking, and must be lacking; for although man obtains Justification through the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, Justification is not itself an operation of the Holy Spirit. Nor can Conversion be dove-tailed into the definitions of the Catechism; of one of the elements of Conversion, viz., Faith, it has spoken above, but the other element, Repentance, it does not touch upon at all. Had Luther wished to describe Conversion, he would necessarily have made prominent another contrast, in the work of the Holy Spirit, than that between Illumination and Sanctification, viz., that between its office of correcting and its office of comforting, which leads, subjectively, to the contrast between Repentance and Faith. But the old Catechisms, and the Symbolical writings generally, prefer to treat the doctrine of Conversion in connection with that of the Sacraments, not only on account of the Romish conception of Repentance

as a Sacrament, but also because of the inner relation of Conversion to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, since Conversion should follow Baptism just as it should precede the Lord's Supper for which it is a preparation; compare the beautiful passage in the Larger Catechism, near the conclusion of the Doctrine of Baptism: "From these considerations thou seest clearly that Baptism in its force and signification includes also the third sacrament called Repentance, which is really nothing but Baptism. For what else is Repentance but a lusty assailing of the old man, and an entering upon a new life? Therefore if thou livest in Repentance thou dwellest in Baptism, which is not only a sign of this new life, but also produces, starts, and continues it; for therein is given grace, courage and strength to keep down the old man that the new man may stand forth and become strong."

The Larger Catechism contains nothing more definite on the Order of Salvation than the Shorter, and differs from it in regarding the entire Third Article as an Order of Salvation,—since Luther says: "Just as the Son obtained the kingdom, in which he exercises dominion over us, by his birth, death and resurrection, so the Holy Spirit effects Sanctification, by the following agencies: the communion of the holy or Christian Church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting."

We pass over to the rest of the Symbolical Books, viz. to the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, where are the Articles *On Justification* and *On Repentance*, the latter in connection with the Article of the Confession of Faith,* *On the Law and the Gospel*, from which can be gathered the elements of the doctrine of the Order of Salvation. The Article of the Confession of Faith *On Free Will* treats of Conversion, but as far as the Order of Salvation is concerned, goes intentionally (see page 671) only to the distinction between the objective hearing of the divine word, which is, to a certain degree, a matter within man's control, and the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit—another distinction in the Order of Salvation, to be mentioned however only in passing—

*The *Formula Concordiæ* of the Lutheran Church.

e. g. see p. 670 : "It pleased God by this means . . . to call men to eternal salvation, to draw them to himself, to convert, regenerate and sanctify."

Man is justified by Faith and not by works, because (1) the works which man does of his own strength can result only in a *justitia rationis*, a merely external and civil justification, and those works which he performs in Christ's strength are unclean and imperfect; (2) forgiveness of sins, upon which, in the sinner's case, all justification depends, is a thing promised for the sake of Christ, and the promise can be fulfilled only through Faith. Hence it follows that, in the Order of Salvation, Faith must go before good works, Justification before Sanctification. Instead of proceeding with this point, I shall quote two passages in proof that it is not inconsistent with Protestantism to allow, inversely, good works to precede Faith, and to regard them not merely as an evidence of Faith, but likewise as a means of strengthening and awakening it. The Defense of the Augsburg Confession says, in the Third Article, *On Love and the Filling of the Law*, p. 116 : "Christ often annexes the promise of forgiveness of sins to good works, not because he intends good works to be a propitiation, for they succeed reconciliation, but for two reasons: first, because of necessity good fruit must follow; he thus forewarns us that that Repentance is hypocritical and fictitious which does not bear good fruit. Secondly, because we require external signs of so great a promise, since a timid conscience needs a manifold consolation. As Baptism and the Lord's Supper are signs which from time to time remind, encourage, and strengthen timorous souls, in order that they believe more firmly that their sins are forgiven; so also the same promise is written and depicted in good works, in order that these may be friendly reminders of it, to the end that we believe it more firmly. Those who have not performed good works do not address themselves to believing, but despise the promise; the pious, on the contrary, embrace it, and rejoice to have its signs and testimonies. For that reason they occupy themselves with these signs and testimonies. As therefore, the Lord's Supper does not justify, *ex opere operato*

without Faith, so works without Faith do not justify, *ex opere operato*."

With these statements the Larger Catechism is in full accord. In its explanation of the adjunct to the Fifth Petition, "As we forgive our debtors," it considers human forgiveness to be a sign of the divine forgiveness, and then adds: "Whatever Baptism and the Lord's Supper, instituted to be outward signs, do, this sign also can do, to strengthen and gladden our conscience, having moreover the additional advantage that it can be used on all occasions, since it is always at call." What more could be said of good works than that the same important relation to Faith, and consequently to Justification, is attributed to them as to the Sacraments? We certainly should not restrict the strengthening of Faith by works, in the sense of the passage just quoted, to those already justified; it applies also to those not yet justified, when they perform good works with an honest endeavor, and thus from a faith beginning in those works, which are in this way so requisite to their religious development, that, when the proper time comes, they attain unto real justifying Faith. Is not Contrition, e. g., such a work preceding Faith? By this conception of the relation between Faith and works, Paul and James are reconciled to each other. The Romanists, too, one would think, must be pleased with it, since they also ground Justification upon reconciliation, and regard it an imputation of the merits of Christ, although, to be sure, they prefer to make the comfort of Justification depend not merely upon works in general, but upon particular works performed in the Church, or prescribed singly by the Priest, and are afraid of justifying Faith, not, as they say, because of its pernicious influence on the morals, but on account of the independent position which, in consequence of this Faith, the individual would assume in relation to the Church. On the Article of Justification there could be agreement, were it not for the Article of the Church. As for the Protestant System, it is not affected by the doctrine of the reciprocal action of Faith and Works. For good works are at liberty to precede or to follow Faith. They sustain only an indirect relation to Justification, since, although they coöperate for the attainment

or maintainment of Faith, in the act of Justification they are out of the question; Justification taking place, not on account of any human virtue, but because of Christ's merits which Faith appropriates. And on this keeping of works aloof from the act of Justification, everything, according to the Confession of Faith, depends—(see p. 687): "The greatest care must be taken, if we desire only to preserve the Article on Justification, lest those things which precede and which follow Faith be added to, or inserted in, this Article, as necessary to Justification, or in any way pertaining to it. For to treat of man's Conversion and of his Justification, is not one and the same thing. Not all those things which are requisite to true Conversion pertain also to Justification. For to Justification these things only are requisite and necessary; the grace of God, the merits of Christ, and Faith which embraces these very gifts of God in the promise of the Gospel." Justification, moreover, still retains its place before Sanctification; for while good works are pleasing to God solely for Christ's sake, they are good only so far as they proceed from Faith, and as through the declaratory act of Justification (although it does not immediately appear in consciousness) and the communication of the Holy Spirit associated therewith, the life is separated into two parts, of which the one is a life under the Law, and the other a life under Grace.

The Article *On Repentance* is a not less generous fountain of the symbolical doctrine of the Order of Salvation. Here, especially through the distinction between Contrition and Faith, we enter upon the development of the religious life, and when we add new obedience as the third element of Repentance—according to the *Defense*, p. 165, "If any one choose to add a third part, viz., fruits meet for Repentance, i. e., a change of the whole life and deportment for the better, we shall not object"—we have the Order of Salvation complete. The apparent anomaly that Justification is the consequence of Conversion, while only a part of Conversion, viz., Faith, comes into view as the instrumental cause of Justification, has been explained already. The Confession of Faith, p. 689, positively excludes Contrition from Justification: "Not Contrition nor Love nor any other virtue, but Faith

only is that single means and instrument, by which we are able to lay hold of the merits of Christ, and receive the forgiveness of sins." I recall no passage in the *Defense* in which the relation of Contrition to Justification is expressly stated; but the whole doctrine of Repentance, and particularly the contrast between its two moments, the negative and the positive, Contrition and Faith, mortification and vivification, is certainly portrayed with unsurpassed clearness.

Calvin, in his *Institutes*, Bk. iii, chap. 3, distinguishes Faith from Repentance, and makes Faith precede, leaving Repentance with its two elements, mortification and vivification, to follow. According to him, Bk. 1, §5, Repentance is a true conversion of our life to God, followed by a sincere and serious fear of God, and consists in the mortification of our flesh and the old man, and the vivification of the spirit. The Calvinistic system is thus distinguished from the Lutheran (1) by a different use of words, (2) by the placing of Faith before repentance, and (3) by another understanding of the conception of Repentance with its two components, mortification and vivification. As far as the use of terms goes, it is so certainly correct, that in many passages of the New Testament, e. g. Acts xx, 21, which Calvin quotes, Repentance and Faith, mentioned side by side, are thus distinguished from each other; and the Confession of Faith, in its chapter *On the Law and the Gospel*, has likewise the more narrow conception of Repentance in distinction from Faith. But Calvin himself adds that "under the name of Repentance" he has comprehended "the whole of Conversion to God, not the least part of which is Faith." It is just to distinguish between Repentance in the narrower and in the wider sense, as Contrition merely, or as including Faith; and this vacillation in the use of terms has its proper sanction in the fact that Repentance without Faith is no Repentance unto life at all; thus faith does belong to the conception of Repentance. But when Calvin puts Repentance after Faith, it seems to me that he is very unpsychological. To be sure there is a reciprocal action between Faith and Contrition; without Faith, Contrition can be no hearty Repentance, and above all can not lead to the mortification of the flesh,—only

the co-operation of Faith and Contrition produces mortification as well as vivification. But, for that reason terror on account of sin, aroused by knowledge of the law, can and must precede Faith. On the other hand, belief in the forgiveness of sins can not exist at all without an antecedent knowledge of sin. In the Romish system, indeed, Faith very properly precedes Repentance, as Melancthon says in the *Defense*, p. 172: "When our opponents affirm of Faith that it precedes Repentance, they understand by Faith, not that which justifies, but that which believes, in general, in the existence of a God, in the punishment denounced upon the wicked, etc. Over and above that Faith, we require every one to believe that his sins are forgiven. For this Faith especially do we contend . . . This Faith so follows the terrors of the law, that it loads them with chains, and gives to the believer a peaceful conscience." With Calvin there is never a restricting, but always an over-stretching of the evangelical conception of Faith, which prompts him to put Faith before Repentance. In his opinion, Faith should not be conditioned upon Repentance, but should condition it. Now it has been shown that it harmonizes well with the evangelical system to consider Faith as conditioned upon preceding works.

The third point of difference is closely allied to the second. According to the *Defense*, vivification arises from the consolation of the Gospel. It is thus given with Faith. Calvin on the other hand, considers mortification and vivification as active and operative; mortification, with him, is the crucifixion of the old man through the communication of Christ's death, and vivification the resuscitation of the new man through the communication of his resurrection. Repentance with him occurs simultaneously with Regeneration; to quote his own words, §9: "In one word, therefore, by Repentance I understand Regeneration, whose scope is no other than to reform in us the image of God, which by the transgression of Adam has been disfigured but not obliterated." In §3 he expresses himself on this contrast, in opposition to Melancthon, although he does not mention Melancthon: "But concerning Repentance, certain learned men, long before our day, have said (because they desired to speak sim-

ply and sincerely according to the scriptural rule) that it consists of two parts, mortification and vivification. Mortification they define to be the grief and terror of soul begotten by a knowledge of sin and a sense of God's judgment. . . . This is the first part of Repentance, and they call it popularly Contrition. Vivification they understand to be the consolation born of Faith. . . . Now these words, if their proper interpretation only is preserved, do express sufficiently well the force of Repentance; but when vivification is taken for the joy which the soul receives when its perturbation and fear are assuaged, I do not assent, because it signifies rather that desire of living holily and religiously, which arises from Regeneration; as if it were said that man dies unto himself in order that he may begin to live unto God." But in the preceding definition of Repentance, Calvin mentions still another moment of the Order of Salvation, when he says that Conversion proceeds from the fear of God; in §7 he speaks more particularly, and names godly sorrow as the cause of Repentance. Are we not then compelled to admit into our conception of Repentance the opposite, also, viz., Consolation, as the first element of vivification? Generally, Conversion or Repentance, and Regeneration are not the same: Conversion is the human side, the condition of Regeneration. Calvin says, in §9, on Luke xxiv, 47, that a two-fold grace is proclaimed in the verse, Repentance and Forgiveness of sins, and that this two-fold grace is obtained through Faith, for which reason, he treats, first, of Repentance or Regeneration (chaps. 3-10,) and then of Justification (chap. 11.) But Repentance and Forgiveness of sins are not related to each other as two sides of the same transaction: "Repent" is the command of Christ, and "Forgiveness of sins" is the promise annexed. Only so far as Repentance is continued in the new obedience, and thus in Sanctification, is it parallel with Forgiveness of sins or Justification. We hope to return to this subject, in speaking of the doctrine of the later Theology, which likewise comprises, in one conception, Conversion and Justification instead of Justification and Sanctification.

While Calvin derives Repentance from Faith, and locates

the former, by identifying it with Regeneration, too much in the Christian life itself, the Confession of Faith can not free itself from the charge of an opposite narrowness, since in the chapter *On the Law and the Gospel* it holds that the Law is only a preaching of Repentance, viz., Repentance in the narrow sense, as, on p. 711, it distinguishes between the wider and narrower conception of Repentance. Of course it is clear that Repentance must be founded on the preaching of the Law, since the preaching of the Gospel without the preaching of the Law would produce no Repentance; but for that very reason, the Gospel, and surely the Gospel as such, must cooperate for the rise of Contrition. The Confession of Faith makes a distinction not only between a wider and narrower conception of Repentance, but also between a wider and narrower conception of the Gospel. In the narrower sense the Gospel is the preaching of the grace of God and the forgiveness of sins; in the wider sense, the Gospel comprehends the entire teaching of Christ and the Apostles. In the latter sense, we may concede to the Confession of Faith that the Gospel is also a preaching of Repentance. In that case the Confession says that the sufferings and death of Christ proclaim the wrath of God. But this is still not the distinctive preaching of the Gospel; it is the preaching of Moses and the Law, and therefore an extraordinary work of Christ, through which he comes to his peculiar office, i. e., to proclaim grace, to comfort and to make alive, which is properly the preaching of the Gospel. Moreover, the punishment of unbelief is attributed by the Confession of Faith to the agency of the Law. But these restrictions do not suffice; it is a one-sided view of the case to regard Repentance as originating only in fear; the preaching of the grace and love of God itself awakens in the sinner the sense of shame, and thereby a deeper Repentance than could ever arise from the mere threatening of the Law. And when, still further, we class with Repentance the resolution to sin no more,—as the Confession of Faith does, p. 711, “to repent signifies nothing else than truly to be convinced of sin, earnestly to deplore it, and in future to abstain from it”—how can we derive this resolution from the Law only? The

Confession of Faith is afraid that the Gospel will be transformed into the Law, if Repentance is derived from the Gospel. But the essential difference of the two, as they cooperate for Repentance, stands out in bold relief.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE OLD PROTESTANT DIVINES.

From the preceding analysis of the Symbolical Doctrine, it appears that the principal members of the Order of Salvation are Conversion, Justification, and Sanctification, and that the Order of Salvation manifests itself, not only in the succession of these conceptions, but also in the unfolding of each particular one—especially Conversion. These three conceptions Gerhard also discusses, and certainly in their natural order; for, in chap. 16, he treats of Repentance, in chap. 17, of Justification by Faith, and in chap. 18, of Good Works. Although he has no systematic arrangement answering to the general plan of his work, he is all the more careful, in the first paragraph of every chapter, to explain in a simple, practical manner, the connection of that chap. with the one next preceding. Thus in chap. 16, § 1, he says: "The doctrine of Repentance which is a certain living practice, [*viva quædam praxis*] of the Law and Gospel, appropriately follows the doctrine of the Law and Gospel." The reason why the doctrine of Justification follows that of Repentance, he thus states, chap. 17, § 1: "To the man convicted a sinner by serious trouble of conscience, the evangelical promise of the grace of Christ must be declared Lest carnal men abuse the doctrine of our gratuitous justification before God for Christ's sake, and employ it for security and indulgence in sinful desires, the chapter on Repentance is premised, without which the grace of Christ and the righteousness pleasing to God have no place in us. . . . Add to this, that in the express language of Scripture, our justification in the sight of God is ascribed to true faith in Christ, which is unquestionably the principal part of Repentance." The connection of chapter 18 with chapter 17 he shows essentially in the following words: "Although we are justified by faith without works, so that good works are removed from the forum of Justification, nevertheless that true and vital faith

by which we are justified is not without works, since Justification and Sanctification, Regeneration and Renovation, are united by a perpetual and indissoluble bond."

A systematic arrangement in the doctrine of the Order of Salvation began only when they set about to include under a higher and more general conception, the various moments of the development of the Christian life. This was accomplished by Calov and Quenstedt (see Hase, *Hutterus Redivivus*, § 111.) I have examined Quenstedt's *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, and Hollaz' *Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum*, as far as was necessary to satisfy the scope of the present discussion. Hollaz is certainly the theologian who has presented the doctrine of the Order of Salvation in its most perfect form, and has fashioned all the separate moments, for the most part, into definite conceptions. But the name, *Order of Salvation* (*Heilsordnung*), Hollaz did not have, so that its discovery—if, according to Schmid, in his *Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, we conclude the succession of the old Protestant divines with Hollaz—does not belong to the development of the old Protestant theology. But that Hollaz had the conception of the Order of Salvation in full measure, is evident from the following passage *On Applying Grace*, Question 2, Proof d: "Applying Grace is in order, because the Holy Spirit operates by distinct acts and steps regularly succeeding one another, so that the first step having been permitted by sinful man, the second follows, and then the third, and so on; while, on the other hand, the first step of applying grace having been ignored or despised, the second does not follow, and the second being repelled, the third does not follow, just as on a ladder we can not reach the highest round except by the intervening rounds."

The doctrine of the Order of Salvation occurs, with Quenstedt as with Hollaz, in the doctrine of the First Principles of Salvation, especially in the chapter "On the Applying Grace of the Holy Spirit," since these writers exhibit the several acts of this Grace. Quenstedt's order of discussion is: The Gracious Call, Regeneration, Conversion, Justification, Repentance and Confession, Mystical Union, Renovation. Hollaz' work has the following chapters: Calling Grace, Illu-

minating Grace or the Illumination of the sinner called into the Church, Converting Grace, Regenerating Grace, Justifying Grace, Indwelling Grace and the Mystical Union, Renovating Grace, Preserving Grace and the Perseverance of the faithful, Glorifying Grace and the eternal Blessedness of the believing who persevere, together with the everlasting Damnation of the unbelieving. It was not necessary for me to write out these several particulars, because they can be found in Schmid's work mentioned above; but I have done so designedly, because they show that Quenstedt, as well as Hollaz, describes not only the active but also the passive operations of grace, and thus intends to give the Order of Salvation complete. But when, in the doctrine of the Means of Salvation, both of them return to this subject, a mistake, which Schmid also points out, is certainly made in the systematic arrangement. They oppose the means on the part of God to the means on the part of man, and thus treat of Repentance, Faith, and Good Works. (Quenstedt having already brought the doctrine of Repentance into the chapter on Applying Grace, discusses only Faith and Good Works). The moments of the Order of Salvation can not be unfolded without these means on the part of man, and to think of fulfilling these conditions by his own strength, lies just exactly at the farthest remove from the old Protestant theology. For Conversion in particular there is, besides the active and passive conceptions, still a third intransitive conception; but Hollaz exhibits this third one also, when, *On Converting Grace*, Question 1, Proof *b*, he adds to the well-known comparison with the trunk and the stone, another not less clear: "Intransitive Conversion is the terminus and effect of transitive Conversion, and is Repentance itself, in which the sinner, through the strength conferred by divine converting grace, and passively received, is said to convert himself, just as a ship is said to turn itself, although it does so, not by its own power, but by that of the sailors." However the old Protestant divines were led to that arrangement, not merely in the interest of human freedom, but chiefly because of the necessity of discussing the principal Protestant dogmas outside of the Order of Salvation.

[CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT NUMBER.]

ART. VI.—“HOPKINSIANISM BEFORE HOPKINS.”

[Supplement to Article in the October Number.]

IN THE previous number of this REVIEW, we gave a highly interesting paper, under the above caption, in connection with an original Letter, never before published, from ROGER SHERMAN to DR. HOPKINS. We think it was made evident in the article referred to that the tenet which has been regarded as peculiar to Hopkins—“willingness to be damned for the glory of God,” was held in its full extent by Thomas Hooker, of Hartford, and, in a qualified manner, by his son-in-law, Thomas Shepard, of Cambridge, more than a century before Hopkins entered upon his public ministry.

Still it is left somewhat doubtful, whether Hopkins was aware of the views of Hooker and Shepard, although strong presumptive evidence is furnished that he was. This evidence consists in the fact that Giles Firmin's book, in refutation of Hooker and Shepard, was republished in this country at Boston in 1742, and could not have been unknown to Edwards, with whom Hopkins was intimate, and at whose house he repeatedly visited. It would, of course, become naturally a topic of conversation, and Hopkins would become aware of the sentiments of Hooker and Shepard, names which he would regard with the highest respect.

But evidence that this was actually the case is vastly strengthened by some facts not adduced in the article. The first of these is that Firmin's book, republished in 1742, occasioned a sharp controversy that attracted attention through New England, and especially in Connecticut. Three years after Firmin's book appeared in Boston, Andrew Croswell, for many years a pastor there, published a pamphlet in which he controverted Firmin's view of justifying faith. It bore the title “What is Christ to me, if he is not mine? or, a Seasonable Defense of the Old Protestant Doctrine of Justifying Faith,” and it contained Croswell's “Answer to Mr. Giles Firmin's Eight Arguments,” in confutation of his “false” notion of faith.

To this pamphlet, Solomon Williams, of Lebanon, a cousin

of Jonathan Edwards, and his antagonist there, a few years later, on the "Qualifications of Communion," wrote a reply. This appeared in 1746, in pamphlet form (4to, pp. 45) under the title of "A Vindication of the Gospel Doctrine of Justifying Faith." It is very severe both in reference to Croswell and to his pamphlet. It sustains Firmin's positions throughout on the subject of justifying faith, passing over altogether the points upon which Firmin is directly at issue with Hooker.

With this controversy, which would naturally make Firmin's book well-known among the New England ministers, Hopkins must have been quite familiar; and if so, we can scarcely suppose him unacquainted with the general scope of Firmin's book, or of his strictures upon Hooker and Shepard.

But there are other facts bearing upon the question. Hopkins and Bellamy were friends, and in a sense neighbors, although one was at Bethlehem, Ct., and the other at Great Barrington, Mass. Bellamy was an old acquaintance of Croswell, before the latter went to Boston, and while he was yet settled at Groton, Ct. At some time, probably on a visit to Boston, Bellamy fell in with Alexander Cumming, also settled over one of the Boston churches, and a neighbor of Croswell. The two (Cumming and Croswell), engaged in controversy on topics kindred to those discussed between Croswell and Williams. In 1762, Croswell published "A Letter to the Rev. Alexander Cumming," to which Cumming replied in 1763, in "Animadversions on Rev. Mr. Croswell's late Letter." In this controversy the peculiar tenet of Hopkinsianism was directly called in question.

It was in connection with this controversy—and not improbably an occasion of it—that Cumming, in conversation with Bellamy, mentioned to him that Croswell had said in a sermon: "A damning God is not an object of Love." Bellamy asked Cumming what he thought of such an expression. Cumming replied that it was blasphemy. For this, Croswell called him to account, probably in the letter which he published.

In his "Animadversions" Cumming says (p. 7): "It is imputed to us as an opinion that a person must be contented

and willing to be damned, or made miserable forever. The spirit of the letter very much consists in this imputation, and it seems very much the aim and tendency of it to make the reader believe this is our doctrine. . . . But we reject this opinion as absurd, and the imputation of it as unjust and inconsequential. Nor do I believe that any sober man ever held or taught it, however much it may have been imputed to divers. My doctrine, I own, is the same as Mr. Shepard's, and with him, I apprehend, Mr. Hooker agrees, though his expression be not so guarded as to cut off all occasion of exception."

It is not necessary to vindicate the correctness of the view taken by Mr. Cumming of the doctrines held by Shepard and Hooker, but it is obvious that Cumming himself stood charged with the Hopkinsian tenet, and that the controversy in which he vindicated himself came under the special notice of Bellamy, in Cumming's conversation with whom it doubtless originated. In such circumstances, to suppose that Hopkins, intimate as he was with Bellamy, and united to him in theological sympathy, was not aware of the sentiments of Shepard and Hooker, or of the fact that they had been controverted by Firmin, is to suppose a seclusion, on his part, from a knowledge of the religious world, and of what was taking place, which we should scarcely impute to the obscurest pastor in the obscurest parish in New England.

We must, therefore, assume that Hopkins was aware of the fact that Shepard, but more especially Hooker, had maintained the doctrine which he is credited with originating, and there can be little doubt that he felt warranted in the emphasis with which he put it forth, by the sanction of such names as those of two of the most distinguished of the early theologians of New England.

ART. VII.—THE DEAD SEA.

From the British and Foreign Evangelical Review for October, 1870.

THE DEAD SEA, at least since the early Christian centuries, has been an object of deep and somewhat awful interest. In the fancy of past generations, and in the eyes of old pilgrims to the Holy Land, it was a black and seething pool, sending forth deadly fumes in which neither man nor beast could live. Birds attempting to fly across, fell suffocated into it. No vegetation clothed its shores, and nothing lived in its waters. These were so dense that nothing would sink in them, and so salt that everything near was encrusted with white crystals. A mysterious darkness, besides, overhung the place. This extended to Jericho and the surrounding country. Not merely was it a sea of death, but it was itself a grave. Deep down in its accursed waters had been distinctly seen the splendid ruins of the wicked Cities of the Plain.

The Arabs still call it *Bahr Lut*, the Sea of Lot; connecting it, like the Christians, with that black page of sacred history, on which is scored the lowest ebb-mark of social and domestic morals.

Physically, the Dead Sea is no less interesting. On its banks, the traveller stands on the lowest ground in the world.*

It lies like some mythical monster outstretched on his belly, and with open mouth swallows up the living stream of the Jordan. Steadily the river pours its volume of fresh water into this strange sea. Steadily the sea receives it, and, like the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream, is not a whit the sweeter or the larger for it. And yet it has no outlet. Did a communication exist between it and the Red Sea on the south, or the Mediterranean on the west, the waters of these seas would flow into it, and not its surplus into them.

The object of the present paper is to give an outline of what is known of the Dead Sea, physical and historical; and I begin by sketching it as I saw it myself.

The start for any such excursion as that to the Dead Sea, never fails to be a lively and picturesque scene. Under a low arch spanning the street, a short flight of stone steps leads to the paved court of the Damascus Hotel in Jerusalem. From this court, doors open into rooms on the ground floor,

* Its surface is 1316 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. Its length is 46 miles, its greatest breadth, 10 miles. Its greatest depth is 1308 feet. Its southern end averages only 12 feet. These figures can be taken only as approximations, however.

and outside stairs lead to rooms on upper stories. From these, again, you may gain the flat roof with its low dome, and look over hundreds of other flat white roofs, relieved by precisely similar domes of well-hewn, carefully adjusted, blocks of limestone,* the housetop view of Jerusalem, beautiful by day, enchanting by moonlight. Across the court, roofed only with a blue patch of Syrian sky, on the morning of which I speak, gaily dressed dragomen hurried on endless errands to their employers' bedrooms. There we, among others, were busy packing the things necessary for a few days' excursion, and preparing the baggage to be left till our return. At last we got down, and found our horses standing saddled in the street under the arch. Here was a ragged beggar of so filthy and plague-stricken an aspect as to scare rather than to soften the charitable *Howadji*. There a lady traveller was being hoisted into a palanquin borne between two mules, whose bells kept up a perpetual tinkling as she righted herself in her lofty seat, and finally moved off to the grave delight of a group of turbaned onlookers. Our *mukarry*, or head-groom, was there, of course, in due state, in charge of the horses belonging to our party, his own special beast of burden being a sturdy mule, bearing a capacious bag on either side of it, filled with plaids, books, and luncheon. Two or three dogs, by whose sleeping forms I had picked my cautious steps, by the aid of a lantern, in the gloom of the night before, watched the proceedings from a little distance.

At last we started, a party of five, headed by the dragoman, and followed by the *mukarry* poised on the back of his mule, the carpets and baggage beneath him spreading out his legs to an angle in ludicrous contrast with the solemn dignity of his bearded visage. Scrambling and clattering over the ill-paved streets, we rode out by the Damascus gate, and soon left the city far behind us.

We approached the sea from the convent of Mar-Saba. For a little time the gorge of the Kidron was our companion. At the bottom of it was a shingly water-course, with a chain of patches of white silt marking the pools in which the water had lingered longest. Indeed, it was difficult to decide that the shining silt was not water, till we saw it in a different light, when we perceived that what we had fancied to be pools were really patches of sun-baked sediment. The perpendicular rock-faces of the gorge were pierced with the caves of the early hermits. The morning sun was already burning on the white and barren slopes close to us. The hills of Moab, as

* Mr. Disraeli, in the third volume of his "Lothair," persists in calling this *freestone*.

yet in shade, were of a pale but exquisite hue. A little bird, deep down in the gorge, sang sweetly, and its notes came up to us with a strange but powerful echo. Brilliant flowers, scarlet, and purple, and yellow, and white, grew among the limestone fragments from the hillside above. Further on, the flowers were not so numerous, but they still peeped out from between scanty tufts of a prickly plant (*Poterium spinosum*), which revealed but too plainly the dry, white soil beneath.

The descent became more and more rapid as we neared the plain. We kept a good deal to the bottom of deep, but dry water-courses cut by the winter torrents through the thick slopes of earth and gravel at the foot of the hills. The sides and bottoms of these water-courses were frequently feathered with tall shrubs, and in one of them an immense yellow *Orobanche* was growing, sometimes as a solitary stem of great thickness and three feet in height, sometimes in bunches of from three to nine stems, each bearing its complement of splendid flowers.

When we reached the plain, we rode for some distance over a level tract of dry mud, dotted with clumps of bushes and forests of feathery reeds (*Arundo donax*) ten to fifteen feet in height. A beautiful shrubby *Statice* (*S. Thoninii*) stretched out to us straggling sprays of pink flowers, and here and there the broom of the desert showed its straight delicate shoots dotted with white blossoms (*Retem*, *Genista monosperma*), the "juniper bush" of Elijah.

At last we reached the shore of the sea which had long lain under our eyes. It was not, indeed, that patch of exquisite blue at the foot of the mountain wall of Moab, as I had often seen it from the Mount of Olives. The sky overhead was gloomy, and toward the southern end of the sea there hung a bluish black cloud, giving an unearthly hue to a large part of the landscape. The cloud blurred the outlines of the near tracts of the mountainous sides of the sea, and completely hid its lower extremity. Still it was beautiful. Compared with the hill country of Judea, which is a tract of rolling upland, intersected by valleys, for the most part neither very narrow nor very deep, the scenery of the Dead Sea is striking. At your feet you have a fine expanse of water stirred by the wind into fresh and vigorous wavelets; on your right, the rugged and varied chain which forms the western edge of the hill country of Judea; and, on your left, the dark and forbidding face of the wall of Moab.

A line of foam, made by the breaking of the waves on the shore, was working slowly outward in long curves. This, perhaps, was the first sign of any marked difference between the waters of this and those of any ordinary sea. The foam

was evidently of an oily and persistent nature, so that the term "scum" might fairly have been applied to it. The melancholy array of water-logged and worn drift wood* along the crest of the beach, certainly added to the impression of strangeness already produced by the unbroken line of foam. Still, in the finer *debris* in which the drift was embedded, there were various plants growing, notably, a lovely *Linaria* in full flower, strangely similar to the Alpine form; here, as on the Alps among the icebergs, daring to come to the very verge of the kingdom of Death.

Below the drift wood was a clean pebbly beach, among whose finely rounded stones (many of them black), I found some small pieces of bitumen and a dead fish. The bitumen floats up occasionally from the sea bottom in pieces of various sizes, especially after earthquakes. There is a fine slab of it (cracked, however, in the cutting), let in to the front of the Mosque el Aska, which occupies the southern end of the Haram enclosure in which the present Dome of the Rock or Mosque of Omar stands.

The bed of pebbles slopes rapidly down to the sea, and each shining stone is seen clearly through water of decided transparency; not, however, to compare in this respect with the water of Tiberias. We soon prepared for a bathe, and plunged in. Speaking for myself, I can say I never enjoyed a bathe more. The body seemed gifted with a new buoyancy. Drawing up my knees, I clasped my hands in front of them (Lynch's experiment, apparently), and sat in the water, toppling slowly now to this side, and now to that. I was not conscious of any pricking sensation except at the lips, round the edge of the nostrils, and at the eyes. The taste of the water was more bitter† than salt, though indeed very salt, and thoroughly abominable. But it was quite without smell. I can not say that I felt the clammy, oily feeling on the skin after dressing, complained of by some travelers.

Greatly refreshed by our bathe, we lunched, and visited the alluvial plain through which the Jordan flows to the sea. Over a part of this we had indeed already ridden, in order to gain the northern end of the sea, from a point so much to the

* Barkless dicotyledonous trees, so far as I saw it; but palm trunks in abundance have been observed.

† The bitterness is caused by the great quantity of magnesia in the water. In a gallon of the water, about 3½ lbs. weight of mineral matter are held in solution; of this, nearly 2 lbs. are chloride of magnesium and 1 lb. common salt. An imperial gallon of drinking water may contain about 20 or 30 grains of solid matter in solution; ocean water, about half a pound; Dead Sea water, 3½ lbs., or a fourth of its whole weight.

southwest as Mar-Saba. We now saw it, however, at a point much closer to the actual bed of the river. It was a great stretch of brown, apparently rich, earth, not clothed with grass or bushes, but literally naked soil. Where we first struck it, near the sea, its surface was undulating, and here and there it was coated with a white clay. A few plants, indeed, did dot it, but they were few and far between, and of species which indicate the presence of salt in the soil. The heavy rains through which we had ridden during the second half of our morning journey from Mar-Saba, and the two or three days' rain which preceded, seemed to have made to disappear the white crust of salts described by most writers as coating the surface of this barren alluvium. At least I did not observe it. A number of camels and horses had passed along the path to the fords of the Jordan, and in many places their track was deep in mud and water. This alluvial plain falls suddenly down, perhaps fifty feet, to a lower terrace, and so on, terrace after terrace, the plain of each better clothed than the last with low vegetation and bushes, till the bed of the Jordan itself is reached, and you get glimpses of a narrow but rapid and muddy stream, flowing in the heart of a dense jungle of tall reeds, feathery tamarisks, trailing plants, and poplar trees (*Populus Euphratica*, its western limit). Such, then, is the bordering plain formed by the Jordan at the northern end of the sea and the actual beach.

The western side we now know well from the explorations of various travelers, and especially from the graphic account of a journey made in 1863-4 by the Rev. H. B. Tristram and party along its entire length. On the lower face of the bounding hills, there is very distinctly seen, as you stand on the northern shore, a whitish band. This is formed of chalky limestone diluvium and gravel mixed with shells of existing species. It appears at various places, and is often seamed and riven by water in every direction, till what has been a continuous bank of tertiary marl is cut up into a pack of isolated and fantastic flat-topped mounds. These are continuous with the flat-topped mamelons of the higher plateau of the Jordan valley, and probably mark the level of the sea, at the close of the tertiary period, when it must have stood about 230 feet above its present level. Higher still, on the face of the reddish secondary limestone hills, Tristram marked the distinct terraces of still more ancient beaches, and on the shore proper he counted at one point as many as eight low gravel terraces, marking different levels of the sea of comparatively recent date. The highest of these was 44 ft. above the present level.

At many places the deposit from the water was binding together unrolled fragments from the rocks above into a conglomerate, many of the fragments themselves being an older conglomerate, in its turn made up of unrolled stones. At various places he found deposits of bitumen with pebbles embedded, or bituminous shale ("stink-stone," stone of "Moses") which burned freely when thrown on the fire. Thrice the party came upon sulphur hot springs surrounded by absolute desolation, and coating the rocks and shingle with a yellow efflorescence. They found also many balls of sulphur, traceable apparently to these springs. At many points, dead bushes stood on the shore glistening with salt crystals.

The rock was chiefly hard crystalline limestone, and this hardness of texture accounted for the bold and varied forms of the hills on the western shore of the sea, as compared with the soft and rounded forms of the Judean uplands. The lie of the strata seemed to be similar to that of the hills of Moab on the western side, and was seldom much disturbed from the horizontal. The fossils got by Tristram's party on the west, were the same as those got by Lynch's party on the eastern side. But the sandstone which forms the base of the eastern range is omitted entirely, so far as is known, in the western. The fresh water springs, Ain Feshkah, and Ain Jiddy (Engedi, of the sacred record), like the sulphur springs, had a high temperature. But with the exception of pieces of sulphur, accounted for by the sulphur springs and pumice-stone washed ashore by the sea, and brought down probably by the Jordan from the upper volcanic region, there were no appearances of recent volcanic action; the sulphureous sand and calcined bitumen of the Wady Mahauwat, being evidently a subaerial deposit. At one or two places only did they find even the old trap rock appearing in dykes through the limestone.

Around the fresh water springs, animal and vegetable life was abundant. At places, a thick belt of cane-brake fringed the shore. The fresh water, and even the salt springs at the southern end of the sea, were full of fish; but even those of the salt springs died if put into the water of the Dead Sea. The only living things Tristram ever saw in the sea were the larvæ of a gnat; and yet ducks and wading birds were often observed to all appearance feeding in it.

Whatever conclusions we may come to, are to a certain extent provisional. They affect, it must be distinctly understood, only the general physical history of the district. They seem to me to render certain sites for the cities of the plain,

which assume that the position of Zoar is known, either at Um Zoghal at the south-west end, or near the promontory at the south-east end; and that Jebel "Usdum" is a reminiscence of "Sodom," improbable or impossible (see note on p. lxx). But they do not commit us to any views of a special kind as to the destruction of the cities of the plain. They do not exclude, for example, the favorite and probable hypothesis that an earthquake was the natural cause of the overthrow. Holy Writ informs us that a rain of fire and brimstone (sulphur) was the visible agent. Sulphur being insoluble in water, the analysis of the Dead Sea water presents no trace of it. But it is present in the district. And a better acquaintance with the geology may result in the discovery of beds or masses of the substance, as *c. g.*, at Bex in Switzerland, in analogous salt-rock, limestone and gypsum formations.

So far as the facts already collected are concerned, we are warranted, I think, in coming to the following conclusions:—

The gigantic fissure which runs from the roots of the Lebanon to the southern end of the Gulf of Akabah, and, slightly changing its direction, stretches as the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean, can scarcely have been otherwise formed than by volcanic action, the remains of whose unextinguished fires still heat the springs on the shores of the Dead Sea and the Lake of Tiberias, and shatter with occasional earthquakes such towns as Tiberias and Safed.

In so far as the geology of the northern part of this great fissure is known, that in which the Jordan and the Dead Sea lie, the action seems to have been that of fracture of the crust, and separation of the edges, without large removal or displacement of the strata relatively to each other. And so far as can be gathered from a comparison of the comparatively horizontal stratification of the sedimentary rocks of Tiberias and the Hauran, the vent and greatest external activity of the volcanic force seems to have been at the upper rather than the lower end of Jordan village. However this fissure* was first formed,

* The present floor of the fissure in which the sacred river finds its tortuous way due south to the Dead Sea, first dips below the level of the Gulf of Akabah, after the Jordan has left the jungles of Papyrus which fringe Lake Huleh (Waters of Meron). At the Lake of Tiberias it is 650 feet, and at the Dead Sea over 1300 feet below the level of the sea. At the southern end of the Dead Sea, the Ghor, there called the Arabah, rises again till it reaches an elevation of 1800 feet above the Dead Sea, and 500 feet above the Red Sea. The Dead Sea occupies the remains of the deepest part of this depression. It is being constantly shortened at the northern end by the alluvium of the Jordan, and at the southern end by the alluvium from the large area of drainage (stated at 6000 square miles, constituted by

it has remained in the state in which we see it for a period of time much greater than the human period. The channels of extinct waterfalls, to cite a single proof, are visible over the face of the western cliffs. In order to wear these channels, streams must have fallen for ages into the sea at or near its present level.

The ancient beaches visible one above another on the mountain faces, point to a time when the Dead Sea stood at the present level of the Gulf of Akabah. It must, therefore, at one time have formed an arm of the Red Sea. However the separation took place, the level of the Dead Sea has been sinking, and is now lower than it ever was before. In no way therefore, can the Dead Sea, as a sheet of water formed or enlarged at the time, be associated with the destruction of the cities of the Plain, except in so far as they must have stood somewhere not far from its shores. The lower end of the Dead Sea, which has sometimes been supposed to be the site of those cities, shows no trace of subsidence, and has evidently been steadily silting up during a long period of time by the deposition of alluvium from the northern slopes of the Arabah (the elevated southern extremity of the great fissure in which the Jordan and the Dead Sea lie). Indeed, there is not the slightest trace of the subsidence of any portion of the basin of the Dead Sea during the historic period.

The present aspect of the basin must be referred to the action of water, as already implied, and not to that of fire. Not to speak of the ancient beaches formed by the Salt Sea itself, at its successive levels, the extinct waterfalls referred to, must have been fed by a rainfall on the Judean hills, very different in amount from that which annually sends down the dry water courses short-lived winter torrents, the "deceitful brooks" of which David and Job speak. At the same time the high temperature of the springs indicate the neighborhood of volcanic forces, wherever their vent may be.

The saltiness of the sea can not be traced directly to the range of salt hills called Jebel Usdum, as its waves seldom or never rise so high. But the salt formation, of which Jabel Usdum may fairly be held to be an ejected fragment, impregnates salt springs which run into the sea. Something may also be put to the account of the winter drainage of the eastern side of Jabel Usdum. It is far from unlikely that there are similar sub-marine springs coming through the same formation.

two-thirds of the area of the Arabah, and the districts drained by such Wadies as Mahauwat on the south-west, and Es Safieh on the south-east.

As the level of the Dead Sea at any moment is simply the point of balance between the water which the Jordan, the smaller streams, and the springs pour in, and what evaporation draws off, and as evaporation is the only mode of escape for the water, all the mineral ingredients (except a small but appreciable quantity lost by evaporation)* remain in the Dead Sea, whose saltness must be steadily increasing. The mineral ingredients held in solution, are in the proportion of one pound of mineral ingredients to three pounds of the water. The salt alone is as twenty-six to a hundred, while in common sea water it is only four to a hundred.

Whatever the birds seen in it may have been doing, none of the ordinary forms of fish or molluscs live in its waters. There can be no doubt that the coral of the Marquis d'Escolopier is a mistake. The *Infusoria* Ehrenberg found in the mud, it is surely natural to conclude, had been washed down from the Jordan, as that river gave the very same species. And the fish living in springs close to the sea, prove as little with reference to the possibility of life in the sea, as the active little crabs and swarming molluscs busy on the fallen figs at several hours' distance from the sea in the fountain of Elisha at Jericho.

While in itself it still refuses to be anything but a Dead Sea, animal and vegetable is able to exist, and does flourish luxuriantly on its shores wherever there is water; and the gloom under which it was supposed to lie, if it ever existed except in the imagination, can be accounted for only by the immense evaporation from its surface. While the climate at the northern end, and about Jericho, is damp, and not healthy like that of the rest of the Jordan valley, Tristram and his party found that of Engedi singularly dry and invigorating, though the Arabs of Engedi said that in summer the heat became so great that they had to retire to the hills behind.

On the shore of this strange sea plants and animals occur which belong, not to Asian, but to African groups of life. The *Osher* (*Calotropis procera*, *Asclepias gigantea*, *A. procera*) to take a single example, whose inflated peach-like fruit, with its mass of silky haired seeds, within the "apple of Sodom" of Holy Writ, is a plant which belongs to Nubia. Its stout stems and large grey leaves soon become familiar to the traveler when his boat has left the wider valley of the lower Nile, and enters on the sterile upper valley in the approach to Assouan, the Syene of Scripture. Many of the birds which

*This was first discovered by Pallas, the famous naturalist, who found the dew in the neighborhood of the salt lakes of Russia in Asia tasted salt.

Tristram found, seemed to belong of right to the African Sahara, and to link the Dead Sea with the ancient salt-lakes (and the still more ancient ocean of which they are the remains), which have left behind them in that belt of desert, deposits of rock-salt similar to that of which the ridge of Jebel Usdum is an ejected fragment.

It is strange, too, to think of the camphire blooming to-day by the fountain of Engedi, the lineal descendant of that which loaded with its perfume the air Solomon breathed as he walked in his gardens; stranger still, if these tropical African flowers and birds, mingled with the flowers and birds of the Levant province and of the Asian continent, carry us back to a past infinitely more distant than the time of Solomon, if they carry us back to a time when there was a different distribution of land and water, of which the living witnesses are these forms of life which mark the overlapping of the flora and fauna of those continents we now call Asia and Africa. Generations, races of men, have come and gone. It has required but a short time to exhaust their vital energy. Generations of stone and lime have lingered only long enough in their decay to attest that on these shores the Jews built in their way, the Romans in theirs, the Saracens in theirs, the Crusaders in theirs. While all these have come and gone, is it not a suggestive, is it not a humbling thought, that a few delicate flowers and birds, whose little life you might crush out between your fingers, have lingered among these deserted traces of man, not one whit less beautiful in their triumphant vitality than when in the morning of the world, they came from the hand of their Creator?

The Dead Sea comes into connection with written history chiefly at two points. It was used, indeed, as a land-mark in the division of the soil of Palestine. Its bitumen was carried to Egypt for embalming, and its water to Rome for baths. The baths of Calirrhæ and the fortress of Machaerus stood near it on the eastern side.

The two points of greatest interest, however, are the Engedi of sacred writ, and Masada of the post-sacred period, both on the western side.

Engedi is associated with the first war on record. When the earliest armed bands of which we have any account emerge from the countries to the east of Jordan, we find them sweeping like a thunder storm over the district to the south of what was afterwards Judah, descending to the shores of the Dead Sea, and lingering for a moment to "smite" the

Amorites who dwelt at Hazazon Tamar. Hazazon Tamar, we are afterwards informed in the second book of Chronicles xx. 2, was Engedi. Keeping still a northerly direction towards the upper end of the Dead Sea, they met and overcame the kings of Sodom,* Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Zoar in the vale of Siddim, which was full of "slime pits." Many in the headlong flight were entangled and lost in these shafts, sunk to the beds of bitumen, and those who escaped, fled to the mountains which hem in the Ghor on either hand like mighty walls, secure refuges from marauders already heavily laden with spoil. The victors then fell on the cities of the plain, and having sacked them, continued their march right up the flat valley of the Jordan, till encamped on its upper waters at Dan, they were overtaken by Abraham and his allies, who attacked them in the darkness, routed them, and recovered the captives, among them was Lot and the spoil.

Engedi comes again into view in the first period of the Hebrew kingdom. It was among the hills and ravines of Engedi that David and his men found shelter for a while from the enmity of Saul. It was in a cave near this spot that David was hardy enough to cut off a part of the flowing skirt of Saul. Following the king with this in his hand, he waited till Saul had got to a safe distance, and addressing him, pointed to the piece of the royal skirt as an evidence of how safe the king's life had been in the hands of one unjustly represented as a conspirator against it.

The enamoured bride in the Song of Songs says of her spouse, "My beloved is unto me as a cluster of camphire in

* The three arguments of greatest weight against the hypothesis that the site of the cities of the Plain was at the southern end of the sea are, (1) Lot's view of them at his feet from near Bethel. Had they been at the south end of the sea he could not have seen them. Of this any traveler may convince himself by making the attempt, as the writer did. (2) The order of events in the campaign alluded to above. The defeat of the kings, and the sacking of Sodom, and the rest of the cities of the plain coming after the smiting of the Amorites at Engedi. And (3) The view of Moses from an eastern peak, probably Pisgah, from which it is said to be likewise impossible to see the southern end of the sea. The cities were not destroyed by water but by fire. And the physical considerations already adduced, show how useless it is to seek the site in the sea itself. The southern end is utterly barren, glittering with salt incrustation. The northern end and all around Jericho is rich (though under the curse of thorns), except the part already described and there are abundant traces of later human inhabitation between Jericho and the Jordan. The whole stage of the sacred history is small, and it would not be out of proportion to place all the five cities of the Plain with their bitumen shafts in the "circles of the Jordan," near its falls into the sea. The barren part, with the common economy of eastern city building, would be occupied by the five cities, if not within the overflow.

the vineyards of Engedi." Engedi was once such a spot of fruitfulness and fragrance as water can create only in the East. To this day, by its scanty rill there struggles up into the splendid day, if not in quantity in kind, a tropical vegetation. Higher on the hillsides, the traces of the ancient vine-terraces are still seen by the traveler. Tristram found at Engedi the "camphire" of the English translation, that white-flowered Henna (*Lawsonia alba*, natural order, *Lythraceæ*) whose powdered leaves were employed in early Egypt to dye the nails yellow, and are still so employed, and whose fragrant blossoms are still sold in the streets of Cairo to the cry, "Oh! odours of Paradise; Oh! the flowers of the Henna!" The Eastern women still perfume and decorate themselves with it.

The last mention of Engedi is that already referred to in 2 Chron. xx. 2, in which the place then known as Engedi is said to be the place formerly known as Hazazon Tamar, or the "Cutting of the Palm Trees."

Tidings were brought to Jerusalem that the invader was on his way to overrun Judah. Gathering from the south and east, the heterogeneous bands of the enemy were encamped at Engedi, where water and forage could be found for so large a force. Jehoshaphat, who occupied the Jewish throne at the time, at once proclaimed a fast, went with all the people to the temple, and following the example of Solomon, led the public devotions in person. It was a terrible moment. The kingdom lay at the mercy of a vast and pitiless horde. The king, it is said, stood in the congregation, and there audibly offered his prayer. From the theocratic king downwards, "all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their wives, and their children." In answer to the king's prayer, the Lord turned the arms of the various tribes of the enemy against one another, and Jehoshaphat reigned the rest of his days in peace.

The ruins of *Sebbeh*, the ancient Masada, like the spring of Engedi, link the desolate shores of the Dead Sea with human history. The story of Masada as related by Josephus ("Jos. Jewish War" vii. c. 8), is as follows: The prophecy of the 24th chapter of Matthew's Gospel had been fulfilled. After one of the most terrible sieges on record, Jerusalem had been taken by the Roman army. The curtain seemed to have fallen in blood and fire over the last act of the long tragedy. But it was not so. The indomitable spirit of the Jew was yet to have an illustration not inferior to anything in the annals of that singular race.

A band of Sicarii, Hebrew zealots who, in the disturbed state of the country, made revenge on the Romans, and on those who submitted to their rule, the cloak of a succession of acts of pillage and murder, had seized the strong fortress of Masada, whose ruins still crown a well-nigh inaccessible craig standing out from the line of mountains which form the western lip of the deep basin of the Dead Sea. The fortress had been greatly strengthened by Herod the Great, who, fearful of some great reverse of fortune, either from the Jews, or from Anthony, from whom Cleopatra often besought Judea as a present, selected Masada as a last stronghold, and stored up there vast treasures, and a supply of provisions and arms sufficient for the longest siege.

When the Roman general invested Masada, his first care was to surround it with a wall, so that no one within might escape. He then began to throw up an immense mound at the low neck by which the cliff was joined to the main line of mountains. At last the siege engines could be advanced close to the walls, and in due time a breach was made. But the breach only revealed an inner rampart of beams of wood laid crosswise, and earth, which the besieged had thrown up behind. On this fresh rampart, from its yielding nature, the battering ram could make no impression. Perceiving this, the Roman general ordered his soldiers to supply themselves with torches, and to fling them lighted against the rampart. When the rampart took fire the wind blew the smoke and flames in the face of the Romans, threatening to destroy their battering engines. The wind however changed, and the rampart was soon a mass of smouldering ruins. When the last hope of the besieged was destroyed, there were 967 human beings within the fortress. The Romans postponed their attack till the following morning, meanwhile redoubling their vigilance lest any of the besieged should escape in the darkness.

When the morning dawned, the Roman soldiers advanced to the breach. But no one appeared, and there was a dead silence over the place. Raising a shout as they stood gazing in through the blackened gap, two women appeared, who, with five children, had hidden themselves in some underground recess. These seven were the only persons left alive of the 967 who were within the walls when the Romans drew off the night before.

The amazed soldiers rushed in, and found the treasures of Herod's palace piled up and on fire. Quantities of provis-

ions were left untouched, in order to show that the garrison had not been reduced by famine. And 960 human forms, men, women and children, lay dead on the bloody ground.

Eliazar, the leader of the Sicarii, after it was evident that further resistance was hopeless, had summoned the garrison, and in a speech which, as given by the historian, is full of the noblest sentiments, pointed out to them that God had forsaken their nation, that the struggle for land and liberty was now over, and that in a few hours the Romans would be in possession of the last stronghold of the race. He reminded them of the cruelties perpetrated in various cities in Palestine on the Jewish inhabitants, and told them that if they resolved to see the light of another day they would virtually resolve to behold, without being able to resist, their wives ravished and their children enslaved.

It was enough. Each man embraced his wife and children for the last time, and killed them with his own hands. Twelve men were then chosen by lot who slew the rest, each man having lain down by his dead wife and children, and the twelve chose one who slew the eleven, examined the prostrate bodies to see that none breathed, and then slew himself.

There still remains to be considered one fact with reference to the Dead Sea, which lends it an interest still deeper than that of its connection with past history. Its employment in the picture of the future of the gospel kingdom (Ezk. xlvii, 1-12) links it with some of the highest hopes of the Christian heart.

Ezekiel stood in vision on a very high mountain, the moral summit of the world. On this mountain there was a glorious temple, which he describes minutely. From under the temple, into which the glory of the Lord had previously entered by the east gate, the prophet saw a strong flow of water issuing. Taken round to the outside of the temple wall, he found that these waters ran out at the east side. His guide, who had a measuring line in his hand, going with the stream eastward, measured a thousand cubits, and made the prophet wade the stream. At this point it reached to his ankles. Again the guide measured a thousand cubits, and brought the prophet through the stream, which reached to his knees. Again the same thing is done, when the waters of the stream reach to the loins; and still again, when the prophet has to struggle back to the brink, finding that they were waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over. This river goes eastward till it reaches the "desert" or barren district already described, near the banks of the Jordan at the north-

ern end of the Dead Sea, and after passing through this, falls into the sea itself. Let us regard for a moment the framework of this remarkable vision. It is evident that in the main it is founded on the physical features of the plateau on which the actual temple stood,—the barren end of the Ghor, and the anomalous character and low level of the Dead Sea. But it departs from physical possibility in one important point. The waters, instead of turning southwards for a short distance, and then turning eastward, as they must have done had they followed what is now called the valley of Jehoshaphat, or upper end of the valley of the Kidron, which, be it remarked, is the natural road for waters issuing from the east side of the temple area, go from the first eastwards till they reach, not the Dead Sea, which alone they could have reached by the gorge of the Kidron, but the salt land, the land not inhabited at the mouth of the Jordan, and then, but not till then, the sea itself.

On the banks of this river the prophet saw trees growing, indeed its whole course was marked by life and fertility; and finally its living waters triumph over the death of the sea. The scene changes. The waters of the Dead Sea teem with fish. Its desolate shores start into life and activity. A line of fishermen plying their trade occupy every available spot from Engedi to Engelaim, and everywhere their nets are seen hung up to dry.

We are now in a position to estimate the singular power and suggestiveness of this prophetic vision. The waters issue from the throne of God and of the Lamb, and it is in this form that John lifts Ezekiel's vision into the still clearer atmosphere of the New Testament. The blessing they confer is received by contact with them. They fertilize where they go. The trees are by their brink. And how true this is to the physical conditions of the natural district referred to, is best understood by him who has ridden long over desolate, whitened uplands, when he comes suddenly to the brink of a watercourse, and looks down on the tops of the trees which flourish by the brink of the stream. The necessity of actual contact with these gracious streams is rendered, if possible, clearer by the solitary exception to their benign influences. The marshy places which, though close to the edge of the sea, had elevated themselves slightly above its level, and refuse an entrance to the waters, were not to be healed, they were to remain under the blighting power of salt.

These blessed waters come from the highest point on the earth's surface in the old vision, the point at which earth was

in contact with heaven ; from heaven itself in the new. They go to the lowest point on the earth's surface, a fact which science has established with regard to the actual sea. The "salt land," the land not inhabited, once the blooming site of Sodom and Gomorrah, is to be reached by the life-giving waters, impossible as it might seem, and the desert is once more to blossom as the rose.

In closing this paper, let us resume in a single paragraph the main points which constitute the human interest of the Dead Sea.

In the very dawn of history we see a cloud of shadowy warriors sweep down on its shores to smite the Amorites at Engedi. Over the same spot the adventures of David the outlaw cast all the charms of romance. In more peaceful times, David's son Solomon walked among the groves of Engedi when the time of the singing of birds was come, and vine and camphire sent forth a pleasant smell. In the story of Masada the same shores are linked with one of those dark deeds of savage bravery of which the passionate heart is sometimes capable in its last extremity of suffering. And as we turn away, we see the subject of our study lying in a light which never was on sea or shore, a light which comes from within, where God sits with the destiny of his church in his hands. The glorious future of a world wherein dwelleth righteousness, is painted by the hand of prophecy with materials drawn from the scenery of the Dead Sea.

ART. VIII.—MINISTERIAL RELIEF.

THE NEED of a more comprehensive and effective mode of Ministerial Relief than any hitherto devised, begins to be admitted by all who have intelligently considered the subject. The radical defect, and utter insufficiency of existing theories and schemes, are apparent at a glance. In this advanced stage of the science of "Applied Christianity," there is not a single branch of the Church that has taken hold of the matter in a scientific way, or put in operation a system worthy of the object, or worthy of the age. There is as yet scarcely a conscience in the matter. A feeble effort has been made by a few denominations, in the line of charity, to relieve specific

cases of suffering as they are brought to public notice. But the conception even of a general provision, or the obligation to seek it, seems not yet to have dawned upon the Church; no concert of action has been invoked; no mode devised to make the Relief bestowed a means of strength and efficiency to the profession as large, at well as of physical comfort to the immediate beneficiaries.

Within a year past, however, a new and deeper interest has sprung up on the subject, not only in our own church, but in other denominations. It has been more widely discussed, and with increased earnestness and breadth of view. Conventions have met to consider it. Several ecclesiastical bodies have taken action upon it, either in the line of devising plans, or of practical results. The Press has not been silent. Several of our religious weeklies have given considerable space to it. And so influential a daily paper as the *New York Times* has devoted several editorial columns to an intelligent and able presentation of it. A number of laymen—business gentlemen of high standing and wide experience, as well as of broad Christian sympathies—have given no little time and consideration to a wise solution of the problem. And, finally, a Society has been chartered and organized, representing the several branches of the Christian church, in its board of Trustees and Directors, for the sole purpose of promoting this interest in the wisest and most efficient way that the practical sagacity and enterprise of the age may be able to suggest.

We trust a new dispensation is heralded in these movements. The last Southern Assembly of the Presbyterian Church took an advanced position on the subject. Their "Sustentation" Fund did not meet the demands of this object, and so they proposed a scheme of Ministerial Relief, which, while defective and complicated, we think, is still far in advance of anything that the Northern Assembly has proposed.

It seems to us, therefore, desirable to discuss this whole subject at the present time, and get all the light we can upon it; and especially to discuss it in its relations to our own branch of the church, before its lines of reconstructed poli-

cies shall be definitely settled, and the machinery for our benevolent work permanently readjusted.

And, to be of essential use, this discussion should be radical and exhaustive. Very little thought or attention has ever been given to the subject; no other matter of such grave moment to us as a denomination has received so little. We have done what we have, more from a generous impulse, and from the conviction that we ought to do *something*, than from a clear and intelligent comprehension of the subject in its principles and relations. The whole ground-work should be carefully examined. The defects and short-comings of present modes should be looked squarely in the face. If a better system can be devised—one truer in theory, broader in the scope of its benefits, more closely allied to parochial responsibility, and more economical and effective in its practical operations—while harmonious with the pronounced views and policies of the denomination—let us know what it is. Let facts, also, gathered from various fields, and figures, more effective than logic or rhetoric when worked up by patient and laborious investigation, tell their story for our instruction.

In the spirit of these remarks, we submit the following paper, as a contribution to this discussion, earnestly wishing it were in our power to convey to the reader some of the interest and conviction which a long, close study of this subject have wrought in us.

SOME GENERAL STATEMENTS.

1. The Christian Ministry has an *undoubted claim upon the Church*, to whose service it is wholly consecrated, *for an adequate worldly maintenance*. And this claim is not restricted to the period of active service, or the best years of a minister's life, but covers the whole period of it; when worn out, or laid aside by Providential causes, as well as when in health and the flush of life. The teachings of the Old Testament on this point are clear and positive. The maintenance of the Jewish Priesthood was not left to the hazard of chance, or to the free-will offerings of the people. Jehovah deemed it of sufficient moment to ordain "a statute forever," securing a definite,

adequate, and permanent provision for the entire sacerdotal order.

One whole tribe—that of Levi—was set apart by Him and solemnly consecrated to the various kinds of priestly service. The priesthood proper, or higher order of the hierarchy, was confined to the family of Aaron, and special provision was made for its maintenance. But the entire tribe was devoted to the religious interests of the nation, and hence a support was secured to it by Divine enactments. The form, extent, and conditions of this provision form an interesting study, which we commend to the Christian Church as timely and pertinent. We can only glance at some of the features and specifications.

Instead of a share in the land when Canaan was divided, God gave this priestly tribe : 1. "All the tenth in Israel for an inheritance for their service."* 2. Special tithes every third year, to meet any deficiency.† 3. Redemption money, paid for various reasons.‡ 4. Spoils taken in war.§ 5. The perquisites pertaining to their sacrificial functions.¶ 6. The first fruits.§ 7. The family of Aaron had 13 cities, and the Levites 48 cities** assigned to them, with "suburbs," or pasture-grounds for their flocks ††

These provisions were obviously intended to secure religion against the evils of a caste of pauper and dependent priests, who would dishonor the Sacred Name, betray the faith they were appointed to guard; and, at the same time by relieving them from worldly cares, enable them to minister in holy things with quiet minds and undivided energies. While removed from the condition and temptations of a *wealthy* order, they were yet carefully secured against a state of indigence or dependence. The numerous "*cities*" assigned them, with ample pasture-grounds annexed, shows that God meant it to be a *permanent* feature of his economy; meant to shelter and afford a home, as well as food, to the ministers of his worship. And the language of the Lawgiver

* Num. xviii, 21. † Deut. xiv, 28, xxv, 12. ‡ Num. xviii, Lev. xxviii, § Num. xxvi. § Num. xxviii, Lev. vi. ¶ Ex. xxiii, 19, Lev. ii, 14. ** Josh. xxi. †† Num. xxxv, 1-8. We give only a part of the reference texts.

in connection with these statutes, is remarkable. Again and again, while charging Israel "never to forsake the Levites," he avers, "I am their inheritance;" in other words: "I charge myself with the maintenance of the appointed and consecrated ministers of your faith and my worship, and I shall see to it that my statutes are not violated with impunity."

The *entire* sacerdotal tribe was embraced in these provisions. The benefits did not cease * when they retired—as they did by Divine limitation at fifty—from ministering in the Temple. They extended to all the family and tribal relations, save in a few specific cases. The priesthood as a distinct *order*, was specially and permanently provided for; and the people who enjoyed and were benefited by its service, were laid under contribution to maintain it. The withholding of any part of the required provision, the Lord regarded and punished as a sin against his own person. What is not unfrequently seen in the *Christian* church, to the great reproach of religion—viz., the aged, the disabled, and the worn-out minister, thrust upon public charity, and the widow and orphan children of deceased ministers, whose entire devotion to their spiritual calling left them no time to care for their households—in a destitute and suffering condition, dependent on their relations or on strangers for their daily bread:—such an experience was unknown in the Jewish church, except in times of great national apostacy and demoralization, when the Divine laws were all set at defiance.

And, still, it will be readily admitted that the Christian dispensation is not a whit behind the Jewish either in spirit or principle. Certainly Jehovah has not lowered his claims in behalf of his religion in these latter days; nor does he put them forth less distinctly or emphatically. If there be no specific legislation in regard to the form, or extent, or conditions for the maintenance of the Christian clergy—and there is none in relation to the mode or extent of giving for *any* religious purpose—there is no room to doubt what the Divine will is, or what principles are to regulate the church, individually and collectively. "Freely ye have received,

*Josh. xxi., 13-19.

freely give.* "Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel.† There is no mistaking the scope and application of such general principles. He who made such large demands upon his people, in the period of their infancy and comparative poverty, for the honor of religion and the usefulness of his chosen ministry, will not wink at a mean, niggardly, and cruel policy, now that they have waxed great in number and in influence, and at a time, too, when a higher and more exhausting service is exacted of it than ever before in the history of the world.

The truth is, the sacred profession is *wronged* in this matter; and the wrong we verily believe constitutes a sin in God's sight, for which, sooner or later, he will punish his people.

The common idea that God designs that the ministers of religion shall, as an order, be *poor*, and that the condition of poverty is most favorable to their usefulness, finds no sanction either in the Bible, or in common observation and experience. Certainly, among the most active, laborious, and useful ministers in the circle of an extended acquaintance, embracing a period of forty years, were those possessed of means, inherited, or acquired by marriage, authorship or otherwise, making them wholly or in part independent of their salaries; and we can not recall an instance in which the possession of property was an injury to them, but rather the contrary. Why should it not be so? Is not a minister as likely to use such a stewardship to the glory of God as a laymen?

2. In estimating the expense of a support for the ministry it is *not sufficient to take into view the bare necessities of the present*. This is the practical rule. "What can he live on?" is the main question which decides the amount of salary voted to a pastor. And no circumstance which may go to reduce the estimate is overlooked. What are his services worth? What will his needs require, looking at his life as a whole? are not considered. The actual want of *to-day* is all that is provided for. That such a rule is unjust in principle, contrary to the express provisions of God's law, and hard in its operation, it needs no argument to show. Like

* Mat. x. 8.

† 1 Cor. ix. 3-14.

other men, ministers sicken and are laid aside ; overtax their strength and must rest and recuperate ; wear out and must resign ; die and leave dependent families.

And what are they to do, to whom look for bread and shelter, in these contingencies ? Our rule of support provides them nothing. Their only resource is cut off the moment any one of these calamities befalls them. It is a shame and a cruelty ! For a church to demand and receive the entire services of a Christian minister, whose education has cost him years of hard study and thousands of dollars *at the bare cost of food and clothing for the time being*, and as soon as the prime of his years is spent, and a younger man is preferred, or as soon as misfortune befalls him, dismiss him without resources, to be taken care of by his relatives, or suffer actual distress, and possibly die in the poorhouse,* is unfair and unrighteous dealing, and none the less so because done in the name of religion. But the paternal, humane, and all-merciful spirit of Christianity condemns such a course. And yet it is practiced all over the church. It is done so often as to excite no attention, call forth no rebuke. Hundreds of faithful pastors are every year dismissed from their charges for no other reason than the temporary failure of health, in very many cases caused by excessive labor, or because they are getting somewhat advanced in years, and a younger and more popular man will suit them better—dismissed without resource or provision of any kind.

How contrary to the statutes which God ordained in Israel. He did not cast off the disabled, the enfeebled, the worn-out, the aged, or the widows and orphans of the sacerdotal tribe. All were thoughtfully provided for. When the appointed twenty-five years of service in the Temple were ended, the Jewish priest might retire to his home in one of the Priestly Cities, and receive, till the day of his death, his share of the tithes which constituted the inheritance of his tribe.

* Two accredited cases have recently been stated by the press. Dr. Polard, at a late meeting of the Boston Baptist Association, after alluding to the number of disabled and worn-out Baptist ministers now in the most distressing circumstances, related the case of one of them who not long since died a pauper in a workhouse in southern Massachusetts. The other instance was cited in the *Independent* a few weeks since.

3. Conceding the duty of seeking some mode of general Ministerial Relief, we hold that it should be made, for the most part, *prospectively rather than retrospectively*. The basis should be a broad one, and the mode the best that practical and scientific benevolence can bring to our aid. A system that imparts relief *only in cases of actually existing indigence and suffering*, when brought to the knowledge of the church authorities, is faulty in both particulars. The basis is practically quite too narrow. It will cover only a small part of the cases needing help. The most worthy of all it will not reach. And the mode is expensive and unscientific in the last degree. We need a plan that shall embrace all our churches, and organize their individual action into a broad system by which a general relief provision shall be gradually and regularly made, in advance of the need, and by the ordinary mode and agency for ministerial support. The two should not be separated. Support and Provision should go hand in hand. Each parish should lay aside something each year for this object. It should enter into the estimate of each year's expenses. So much for salary; so much for ministerial provision. And the item should be embraced in the "settlement" of the pastor. So long as our churches will restrict their ministers to salaries that leave not a dollar for future contingencies, they are obviously bound to secure them in some way against future suffering. And no plan yet devised is so likely to secure this end, it strikes us, as a plan of parish investment, year by year increasing both by additions and by accumulation, and at once available in the day of need.

Not only is the principle just, but it *is the easiest way to raise the money*. There is truth in the homely adage: "It is hard to pay for a dead horse." It were easier to raise \$100 in a church for a well, hard-at-work, and useful pastor, than \$10 for a disabled or worn-out minister at large. In the former case it will not be viewed as a dead loss or gift outright, but rather as so much active capital added to the pastor's usefulness. It will not take on the form of "charity," but a recognition of obligation that will make his heart to sing for joy, and yield him fresh strength to serve them.

4. *The normal way of doing this work is for each church to*

provide for its own minister, the same as in the matter of current support. No one seriously advocates the maintenance of the ministry by a general fund. It could not be done, at least in this country. "A sustentation" scheme may prove a good thing simply as a supplementary agency to assist feeble parishes in meeting their annual expenses, thus equalizing, in part, the burden. But the *main* portion of the money needed must be raised where it is expended—raised by the parish for the support of its own pastor, to whom it has come under bonds for his living. And the same principle holds good in the matter of ministerial relief. The first and chief obligation rests with the individual parish in which the relation exists and the labor is expended. And no extraneous or general agency can release the parish, if able, from its duty in this matter, any more than it can release it from the duty of raising the salary of its minister.

A supplementary agency is needful to help feeble parishes in this part of their work, also, and to equalize the burden as far as practicable. But we must not, as a denomination, rely upon any such agency. We must invoke the normal condition of things, and conform our policy and mode to it, if we would achieve decided success. We must have a scheme in which the sympathies, as well as the conscience of the Church, have full play. Our present Relief plan is too far removed from personal relations, sympathies and responsibilities ever to be popular and grandly effective. It does not bring the object home to the *hearts* of the people. It does not enlist them in the welfare of those for whom they feel a *special* interest and affection. To give for a general charity, is one thing: to plan and give under a sense of duty, and stimulated by intimate ties of friendship and grace, to make the future of their own pastor and his family comfortable, is quite another thing.

5. The Relief afforded should be *removed as far as possible from the appearance of "charity."* It is *not* a charity in any true sense, but a *right*, viewed in the light of Scripture, or common equity. The Christian Ministry stands forth separate and apart, by God's own appointment, from worldly avocations. It makes a total surrender of life to the end and work of the sacred office. Wholly absorbed in and taxed to

the utmost by the responsible duties entrusted to it, it can not stop to care for the morrow, or look after its own personal and temporal interests. All it asks in return for its arduous, unselfish, and entire devotion to a calling regarded as eminently useful, is a comfortable sustenance for themselves and those dependent upon them. The demand is certainly reasonable and moderate. If the faithful minister is not clearly *entitled* to this much, on the ground of common equity and Christian obligation, then no man can establish such a claim.

Why, then, is the cause of Ministerial Relief put among the *charitable* agencies of the Church? It does not properly belong there. This field is already crowded to excess, and relief in some way is demanded. Why should the manhood and the sensibilities of the minister be degraded and wounded by his being compelled to play the part of a mendicant when he is in want? to seek aid, which, when given by the people whom he serves in the gospel, is as grateful as it is beneficial, but when received as a public charity, is like gall and wormwood to him?

It is not surprising that *so few* make application for this Relief, that a balance of over \$9,000 should be reported as in the treasury of the Fund at the last Assembly, small as the collections were; *so few* that the Assembly enjoined upon Presbyteries greater diligence in searching out cases, and upon the Committee greater liberality in using the fund. It is not that there are not needy cases—indigent and feeble and aged Presbyterian ministers by the hundred, struggling really to live, or supported by their friends. But they can not, after making so many sacrifices, make a still greater one. They will “suffer in silence” first, as the Committee in their last Report admit. But *why* should they be subjected to such a trial? The feeling is instinctive; it is among the most sacred instincts of our manhood. The Jewish Law-giver carefully guarded against the violation of it in the case of the Jewish priesthood. Has the Church a *moral right* to exact such a humiliation? Can she *afford* thus to trifle with the innate self-respect and manly virtue of her spiritual teachers? The writer himself, years ago, when broken down in health, for the third time, by excessive labor during a time

of great and protracted religious interest in his charge, and shut out of the pulpit for years by the stern mandate of his medical adviser, resorted to the axe and spade and hoe, and earned a scanty living by manual labor, sooner than ask help even of the wealthy people whom he had served, and in whose service he had spent thousands of his private means, as well as the prime of his ministry. And this is the almost universal feeling. All that is ennobling and divine in the office of the Christian Ministry, pleads with the people of God to do nothing to impair the tone of manly virtue and delicate sensibility in the breasts of its ministers. There is dignity in poverty so long as it is respected. The minister may be poor without loss to his manhood; be penniless, and yet the peer of the millionaire; but he can not solicit and accept "charity" and not feel degraded.

6. There is an *economic principle* underlying this whole subject which we can not afford to discard. The "Relief" hitherto sought has been only in behalf of "disabled ministers," and the families of "deceased ministers." There can, of course, be but one opinion as to the duty and expediency of providing relief for all such. Humanity puts in a plea as well as Religion, for these. But is not the policy an exceedingly narrow and mistaken one? Is not the principle on which such a scheme of relief is based essentially wrong? Is not the help rendered by this method divested of all spiritual and economic virtue, and narrowed down to the actual amount of physical relief it affords? Any system of Political Economy, or science of Civil Legislation, based entirely or mainly on such a theory and practice, would be rejected by the enlightened philosophy of the age as false and mischievous. "An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure." This sound axiom will apply to the case in hand. To lift men, or a class of men, above the condition of dependence and want, is better philosophy, and a higher order of benevolence, than the creation and application of a charitable fund to afford them relief in the day of actual necessity. To remove, as far as possible, the *causes* of ministerial disability, and premature decay and untimely death, by a wise and provident system of prevention, is incomparably better,

looked at from every point of view, than to aim merely to relieve physical want and suffering when actually endured.

There would not be *so many* "disabled" ministers needing this kind of relief; nor *so many* "widows and orphans of deceased ministers" appealing for charitable aid, had we a broad and liberal system of support and provision in general force. The cause of failing health, of prostrated over-taxed powers, of premature decay and actual death, in cases without number, is no secret: there is no mystery about it. It is not hard work, simply and mainly, that wears out and breaks down and kills our ministers. Facts abundantly show that the profession is signally conducive to health and longevity—more so than any other—and if the duty and labor connected with it, severe and onerous as they are, could be discharged in a favorable mental and physical condition, there would be uniformly better health enjoyed by ministers as a class; there would be the capacity and the strength to perform more work; and their mental and bodily force would endure longer, than is true of any other class in the community. Nothing will sooner derange the digestive organs, disturb the whole delicate net-work of nerves, and induce debility and bodily ailment in one form or another, than an anxious state of mind, trembling fear, and a burden of care that is never lifted.

And to this condition ministers are very generally doomed. Happy is the pastor whose salary is ample (*and sure*) to put his mind entirely at rest in the matter of his daily bread, and who is never harrassed and depressed by the state of his finances. For not a few have trials on *this* point. It is not every hard-worked minister who is able to command the most wholesome and nourishing food, and a plenty of it—such "good living" as our advanced medical science decrees to be necessary to "health," alike of mind and body. And *none need it so much as the minister*. It is a most pernicious idea, so generally prevalent, that *low living* is best, at least will answer, for him. Thousands of *poor sermons* are preached for no other reason than that the minister is *poorly fed*. There is a scarcity, or an inferiority, in the daily living at the parsonage. The physical condition is not equal to the demand

upon it. Sermons lack clearness, logical force, and method in the construction, and animation in the delivery, because there is a "skeleton" in the study, which disturbs the mind of its occupant, and often drives sleep from his pillow, and sends him into the pulpit in a half-exhausted mental and physical state.*

But this is not the worst of the case. *Some kind of a living* ministers do manage, in one way or another, to eke out, so long as they are able to preach, and are wanted. And they are better able to bear the burden *now* than they will be when old age comes upon them, or sickness enfeebles them, or over-tasked powers give way. *Better endure any amount of self-denial and hardship, even, now than to have to come to it then.* The burden of earthly care and anxiety that presses heaviest on the minister's heart and chafes the sorest, is connected with the *future* of his life and of those dearest to him. What will become of him and them, if his health should fail and he have to resign? Who will shelter and feed those dependent on him when his ministries have ceased? Such questions will arise, and will produce bitterness of soul. And is it

*There is another view of the case no less distressing. We are as bad as the Egyptian task-masters. The "Pews" were never more exacting on the "Pulpit" both as to matter and manner. It is a reading, thinking, inquiring, and skeptical age. A minister needs not only a thorough education to start with, but all the available helps which the current thought and investigation afford. He needs a generous supply of new books, papers and periodicals every year. They are not simply a luxury to him, but a necessity. He can not make "bricks" without "straw." He can not be "thoroughly furnished" for his work; be a growing man; produce year by year fresh, sound, vigorous, instructive sermons, and meet the demands of his people, unless he has the means to increase his library with some at least of the standard works, which are continually produced. But alas! they are beyond his reach. He sighs for them, but he has not the means to buy them. He is mentally starved, and his people too, while the book-shelves of our publishers groan under the weight of mental food. His study walls are bare. It is not made attractive to him, and a place of new inspirations by the presence of the great masters of thought. After ten or twenty years in the ministry he could put his entire library into a wheel-barrow.

This is literally true of hundreds of our pastors to-day. During the last ten years they have not been able to add ten new works to their scanty stock. Not over one-third of our 4500 ministers are able so much as to take either of the two denominational *Reviews* which are published; some of them not even a religious paper! We know whereof we affirm—know more than is for our peace of mind on this painful point. A ten years' effort in a humble way to afford them aid in this line, has furnished us with a mass of facts that would scarcely be believed if we were to give them to the public.

strange that such an experience should often *cause* the very evil most dreaded?

And very many gifted and useful ministers, filling important positions in the pulpit, in the professor's chair, and in our benevolent agencies, break down in health and are laid aside for a while, sometimes permanently disabled—by *doing extra and outside work*, in order to supplement an insufficient salary, or lay by something against the day of need. Did not delicacy restrain, we could cite names not a few—some of them the most honored in the Presbyterian Church—to whom the remark will apply. How often, also, does the fear of want—the total lack of anything to fall back upon—induce men to *stay* at their post and keep on with their work, until it is too late to recuperate. And many again resume their work, for the same reason, *too soon*; they are only half cured or recuperated; but necessity is upon them. And the result is, they soon break down again, and hopelessly. Many precious lives would be spared to the church, for years of further usefulness; and better health, and fewer cases of disability would be experienced in the ministry, if there existed a kindly provision which they knew would be available to them and to their families in the great emergencies of life. Prevention is the first demand.

Again, the education of ministers is too costly a process, both in time and money; thoroughly trained ministerial talents and gifts are too rare and valuable in these days to justify a careless or improvident use of them. The true policy of the church is to *make the most* of this great gift, by keeping ministers' minds free from worldly care and depressing anxiety; by subsidizing all their gifts and capacities for labor; and by doing all that is reasonable and possible to sweeten their work to them, and thus add to the measure and duration of their usefulness. If a portion of the efforts and means expended to increase the ministry were wisely bestowed on making the existing ministry *more efficient and longer available*, we might be the gainers in the end.

7. In sustaining the Preaching of the Word and the enterprises of the church, an *undue and burdensome part of the cost is put upon the ministry*. A broad discrimination is made

between the Laity and the Clergy in the matter of consecration, for which we find no warrant either in the Mosaic or Christian Scriptures. Why should so much more be exacted of one than of the other, not merely in the item of personal service, but in the main conditions of life? Why, by a sort of universal decree, should the one as a class be inevitably doomed to a condition of absolute poverty and dependence, while the other are at liberty to roll up their wealth by millions? A man makes the greatest wordly sacrifice in his power—compared with which the silver and the gold of the rich are as dross—when he devotes *himself* to the Christian Ministry. He forgoes all that wealth, luxury, ease and ambition have to offer him. The splendid prizes of earth, so much coveted by the human heart, he once for all renounces. When made in the spirit of Christ, and with an eye single to God's glory, it is the noblest and grandest sacrifice which man ever made. It is made for life. From that hour of supreme dedication of life, being, and service, he is dead to the pursuit of any personal or selfish interest; dead to earthly ambition, pleasure, or emolument. One thought, one work, one care, one "fellowship of suffering"—and only one—is to possess and rule him henceforth. Earthly interests and earthly loves he has in common with others; but they must all be made subordinate; he must seem to have them not, absorbed and pre-occupied by the Master's work. No *other* man is *expected* to make an equal sacrifice, so far at least as it bears on the temporalities of life. And if this great and special sacrifice were properly appreciated by the Christian Brotherhood, it would be accepted as the minister's *full share*, and no additional unnecessary pecuniary demands would be exacted of him. The REV. ALBERT BARNES brings out this point forcibly in some remarks he made in the Ministers' Association of Philadelphia, in reference to the late lamented DR. THOMAS BRAINERD:

"Dr. Brainerd could have made \$12,000 a year by the law as easily as he could make \$2,000; [his salary was \$2,000] therefore he has given \$10,000 a year for the privilege of preaching the gospel. He was entering on his career with every prospect of the most brilliant success, and with a moral

certainly of reaching the highest eminence in his profession. Had he continued to devote himself to the law, long ere this time he would have been in the first rank in that profession. But the heart of the young lawyer was changed by the grace of God, and he resolved at once to abandon his chosen profession."* Ought not that to have sufficed? Was it right to lay upon such a gifted mind, and sensitive soul, and earnest and powerful worker, a life-long pecuniary burden in addition, which often depressed his spirits, and which he was constrained to leave to his family to bear after he was gone?

Besides the total surrender of his life to the church, and the condition of indigence and dependence in consequence, the minister is made to bear through the whole period of his service a large share in the cost of his own maintenance. *Ministers are more heavily assessed as a class to sustain the preaching of the Word than an equal number of our wealthiest laymen.* Comparatively few ministers are fully supported by the pay given them. Half of our pulpits, and they among the foremost, would be vacant, if their incumbents had no resource whatever save the liberality of the people whom they serve. It is a glorious privilege to preach the gospel—an angel might well covet it—but in the human sense the minister has to "pay dearly" for it. We cite a few cases, out of a multitude, by way of illustration:

"Not long since a minister, at the close of a thirty years' pastorate, told his people that it had cost him \$20,000 out of his private purse. And yet he ministered to a wealthy people.—A Presbyterian pastor in New Jersey, at the end of six years, when the loss of health from overwork compelled him to cease for years all mental labor, found that he had paid out of his private means \$3,000—half as much as his entire salary for the period amounted to. And yet his church was one of the largest and most liberal in the State. His labors were greatly blessed to them—nearly 200 being added to the membership. Many thousands, during his pastorate, were expended in enlarging and beautifying their sanctuary; and thousands beside were yearly given to the cause of Christian benevolence. And still the pastor from his slender patrimony was left to pay one-half as much as the whole congregation paid for his support."—*Doc. 2 of Society for Promoting Life Insurance among Clergymen.*

The pastor of one of the largest churches in Connecticut maintained himself among them for fourteen years only by

* See the admirable Biography of Dr. Brainerd, noticed in our last number.

paying as much as the whole Society paid for his support! And the pastor of the other Congregational church in the same place, although a young man and greatly beloved, has to depend on his father for a considerable part of his living. And yet these churches aggregate 900 members! These are not rare cases. And if such things are done in the "green tree," what may we expect in the "dry?" If the pastors of our larger and wealthier churches fare thus, what must be the experience of the mass of brethren who labor in less favored fields?

And this condition of things is not confined to pastoral work. It were easy to mention names by the score in the circle of our acquaintance—men filling important positions, and seemingly indispensable to the church—Professors in Colleges and Theological Seminaries, and Secretaries and Agents of Benevolent Boards and Charitable and Reformatory Institutions—paying each not less, and some more, than \$1,000 a year out of their private means, and forced to submit, sometimes, to great social discomforts (\$3,000 to \$4,000 salary will not secure the luxury of "home" and "house-keeping" in all cases in our great cities), for the privilege of serving the church in the spheres which she has called them to fill.

Is there not a wrong here that should be looked at? Is it not possible that the church is exacting quite too much from her ministers and the leaders in her Christian work? While she is every year growing richer, her ministry, as a class, are growing poorer. *The ratio of salaries to the cost of living is less than it was ten years ago.* The former has increased about fifty per cent., and the latter full one hundred. Our city ministers receive large salaries in many cases, but they are all absorbed, and more besides, by enormous rents and the enormous cost of living, and the extra benevolent calls made upon them. While in the country, not only in parts adjacent to cities, but throughout the rural districts, the general extension of railways and other causes, have greatly and permanently increased the necessities of life and more nearly equalized the cost of living. In numerous instances the country pastor now needs as large a salary as the city; and

in the majority of cases as large as would have sufficed for the city thirty years ago.

It is not pleasant to contemplate the results of this state of facts. The American Clergy as a class are miserably poor—but a step removed from absolute want and suffering. We complain not of their *poverty*, although it contrasts strangely with the acknowledged wealth and liberality and relative strength of the American church, and with the ability and high social position and eminent religious worth and influence conceded to them. But we *do* complain that they are left without any pecuniary provision for the future. They are able to save nothing from their scanty stipends as a resource in the day of evil. As soon as they are disabled they must be thrown upon public charity, or upon their relatives, who in most cases have been severely taxed already by giving them to the ministry and educating them for it; or if they die their families will be homeless and penniless. The Protestant* clergy of this country number 61,000; and less than 7,000 of them have ever been able to avail themselves even in the humblest way of Life Insurance, now so generally adopted by all classes as the best known means of providing for future years. Of the \$2,000,000,000 thus invested by 750,000 of our citizens, probably less than \$14,000,000 belong to the clergy. No words can add force or significance to such a fact. It is mutely eloquent. And it should stir the church to undertake a more general and effective system of Ministerial Relief, and to push it vigorously.

SALARIES OF MINISTERS.

Were these at all adequate, or sufficiently liberal to admit of any saving on their part for the emergencies of the future,

*It is noteworthy, and adds another item to the evidence which is continually coming to light, going to show with what shrewdness and forethought the Roman Catholic Church is prosecuting her work among us, that a large proportion of her resident priests are insured *for the benefit of the church*, as they of course have no families to provide for. It is known to us that one of the oldest and largest Insurance Companies in the country declined a connection with the "Society for promoting Life Ins." &c. (the only instance in which its proposal has been declined) assigning as the sole reason, that this class of its patrons might take offense if it favored a Society which proposed to work for the particular benefit of Protestant ministers!

the necessity of a General Relief system would not be so pressing as it now is. But it is a fact, known to all who have taken the pains to inform themselves, that American ministers are paid *at a rate that barely, with the most rigid economy, keep them above want*. This is the rule; of course there are exceptions. It requires a constant struggle for them to live; close attention to every detail of expenses, and the utmost self-denial, in order to keep out of debt and maintain a respectable appearance. We place before our readers a few facts and figures on this point, gathered by the "Society" we have already named:

1. There are in the United States 61,000 Clergymen, ministering to some 6,000,000 communicants, and 11,000,000 non-communicants, in all 17,000,000 souls. From the best data at command, it is believed that the *average* salaries of these 61,000 clergymen will not exceed \$700 annually. If we deduct from the list the large salaries paid in our chief cities and towns, the average of the mass will not exceed \$600. Probably more than one-third of the whole receive less than \$500.

2. There is no other class of men among us so *poorly paid* as our clergymen. *Their average pay is only a little more than half the pay of skilled mechanical labor*. According to Commissioner Wells' Report, the price of trained mechanical labor ranges from \$3.50 to \$8 per day. Average it at \$4.00 and the mechanic receives for 313 working days \$1,252; while the clergyman who has expended from five to eight years, and from \$3,000 to 5,000 on his education, and who works 365 days in the year, gets \$700 or less!—*Doc. 2, p. 17.*

Is not the sacred profession really *degraded* when the average pay of the minister is less than that of the common laborer—about half that of the trained mechanic, or the banker's or merchant's clerk? There is something essentially wanting, either in our system, or in the church or ministry itself, when such a state of facts exists. In all other kinds of labor the pay is graduated by the nature, amount, and value of the service rendered. Why should the work of the Christian Ministry be made so signal an exception? Is it relatively of less moment? Is it less beneficial to individual man and to society, or to the world at large? Does it not require more time and outlay to fit a man for it than for the common industries of life, or the other learned professions? Is not the labor as severe, and the talent, culture and gift demanded, quite equal? Are not more hours of each week-day required,

than of the mechanic or business man, besides the whole of every Sabbath?

Can any good reason be assigned for so palpable a disregard of all business and equitable principles in the Church's dealings with her ministers in the matter of service and compensation? If it be a rule of Christian ethics that "the laborer is worthy of his reward," why is it kept back from them, and from them alone? If to "grind the faces of the poor" (Isa. iii, 15) be denounced as a sin, is it no sin for the Church, rolling in wealth and luxury, to keep the great body of God's servants but a point above absolute suffering; nay, in a multitude of instances, voting them a maintenance quite insufficient, except as supplemented from other sources, to enable them to keep at their calling?

The question of *increased salaries*, however, does not properly enter into this discussion. That the standard is quite too low, admits not of a doubt; but whether it is practicable to advance it materially, is a point difficult to decide. Our opinion is, that until quite another spirit animates the church at large, the present rule will continue in force.

But if an advance *could* be quite generally secured, it would not bring the desired relief. The ten or twenty per cent. added to the present salary would be naturally, nay, almost inevitably, *absorbed in current expenses*. It would all be gone at the end of the year, and how or where it would be difficult to show. A slight relaxing of the rigid rule of economy here, and a little indulgence of taste or luxury there, would use it all up. It added a little to the score of comfort in the parsonage, but it did nothing to protect the minister's declining years from want, and nothing for his widow and orphan children, when he shall be taken from them.

This is the law of all experience. The minister will not prove an exception. There is a marvelous faculty in man to adapt his expenses to his income, be it larger or smaller. With the minister, necessitated to self-denial and rigid economy, in his own person and in his family, as the universal habit of life, it is only a question of *degree*. There is such great difficulty, and such temptations against laying up for a

time of need, from his limited and unvarying resources, that few would do it, even if a little were added to the salary.

We are constrained, therefore, to believe that the results will be surer, larger, and superior in kind, if we give our main attention to the question of a General Ministerial Provision, to meet the emergencies which will inevitably occur in the future, leaving the matter of salary to be, as now, arranged by the individual pastor and parish. One hundred dollars annually received from a parish, and wisely invested for this purpose, would afford *more actual and substantial relief*—to say nothing of other advantages—than \$300 added to the salary. In the one case it would find its way into the maelstrom of expenses; in the other it would “gain other ten talents,” for the time of actual need.

A DEFINITE VIEW OF THE OBJECT.

We have used the word “Provision” with a purpose. “Relief” is too restricted and specific, besides having a meaning, in the present case, not altogether pleasant. Our “Relief Fund” is applied to two classes only, viz., “disabled” ministers, and “the widows and orphans of deceased ministers.” The conditions on which relief is given are threefold: an existing need, a formal application, and the recommendation of a Presbytery endorsing it. The principle is that of the specific application of a public fund, held in trust or created by annual contributions and donations, for the relief of specific cases of suffering, when brought to light and duly attested. The mode and the conditions of administering the “charity,” are similar to those relating to ordinary charities. If there be any difference, it is in the direction of greater publicity, a severer scrutiny, and a longer process.

God forbid that our pen should write a word in disparagement of such a “charity.” If any man is deserving of relief and sympathy, it is the minister, in his broken-down and unstrung condition. His training and mode of life have unfitted him to earn a living in the ordinary activities of the world. And if “widows and orphans” have any special claim, none more so than those who have shared the lot and inherited the poverty and dependence of the servant of Christ. Still,

somehow, in our inmost soul, we feel a repugnance to such a mode of relief. It is put on a very low plane. Its conditions, if not humiliating, are certainly wounding to "modesty and delicacy." A stern necessity must be felt before a sensitive and high-toned minister, or his bereaved household, will be induced to come before the Church with a tale of want and a plea for help. And the relief will be *endured* only as long as the necessity is unendurable.

Is there no mode of relief practicable, on such principles and conditions as will make it more generally available, and in a way that will not wound the sensibilities of the recipient? that, anticipating and providing for the future by forethought and care, the *relief* will come, naturally, expectantly, and gratefully, with the *need*?

What we want is not Specific Relief, but a General Provision. The true way is to lay up in store year by year, during the pastor's term of active service, that there be no lack when the day of evil comes to him or his; his own, by acknowledged right, to hold, enjoy, and dispose of as other men do. All prudent business men act on this principle in their own monetary affairs. It is the only true policy. It is the only way in which Ministerial Relief can be made general, and at the same time a benignant system for increasing the number and working power and efficiency of the sacred profession. A moderate Provision, in the way of endowment or annuity, made sure to each minister when he retires from active service, or to his family in the event of his death, would work a marked and blessed change on the *morale* of the Ministry, as well as in its general condition.

Nothing short of this should satisfy us. All schemes that do not propose this as their ultimate end, and are not wisely planned to secure it, are wanting in the conditions essential to the object. To this broad view and enlightened policy, the Church, we doubt not, will some day be brought, and the sooner the better, both for her honor and her prosperity.

What if every "disabled" minister in our connection could be induced to make public his dire necessity and receive help; and all the "widows and orphans of deceased ministers," in spite of shrinking delicacy and pride, should present them-

selves at the door of our Committee and be awarded temporary relief? Would the Church have discharged her whole duty? Is not the main and most important part of it still undone? Has not each one of the thousands of her toiling and self-sacrificing servants, whose whole life and being are devoted to her welfare, and who is liable at any time to come into the condition of want, a sacred claim that can not be ignored? Do not duty, obligation, and a liberal policy, all require that *these* also be cared for?

Our Voluntary System is greatly defective here. No public provision can be made in the way of pension, or otherwise, such as is made for ministers, scholars, and other public servants, in the Old World. But this defect of a system, superior in most respects, only makes more imperative our obligation to supply the deficiency. The Military service of the United States has long been pensioned; the Judiciary has more recently been; and the Civil service is likely to be soon. Is Civil government more thoughtful and grateful than the Kingdom of Christ? Shall ministers alone, by reason of their calling, go unprovided for? Nearly every other class have Associations for Mutual Benefit. Physicians, Bank Clerks, Firemen, Policemen, Engineers, the various Trades, Young Men's Christian Associations, avail themselves of the facilities put within their reach to protect their old age and afford relief to their families. Some of these Associations—the Medical for instance—has been in existence nearly thirty years, and proved a means of sure and wide-spread relief to the profession. The Clergy are entitled to a similar system—one embracing all the active members of the body; and the expense of it should be met by their parishioners, or by the Church at large.*

* Our *Foreign Missionaries* have an equal claim. The time has come when the question of how best to provide for them, must be considered. DR. ANDERSON, so long For. Sec. of the American Board, confesses that he had pondered it anxiously for years without coming to a decision. The Prudential Committee have the matter now under consideration, and are likely, as we are advised, to adopt the principle "of a small annual investment as the best means of providing for the missionaries in the service of the Board."

The adoption of such a policy by this noble and venerable Society, will mark a new epoch in the History of Missions. It will forever settle the principle. And it will occasion a thorough discussion as to the best mode

HISTORICAL VIEW.

Something has been done for Ministerial Relief; enough to show that there is a feeble conscience in the Church in the matter. At least five denominations have given attention to the object, and raised, in one way or another, means to be applied to it. The sum realized, however, has been small, not a tenth part of what is needed. The aggregate receipts of these agencies, in 1868, amounted to only \$85,000. A slight advance was made in 1869. But what is that among so many? It would yield, allowing nothing for expenses, \$300 each to 283 disabled ministers or ministers' families—two per cent. of the number of living ministers in these connections!

The first agency in the field, and in many respects the most important, was the "Presbyterian Annuity Society," located at Philadelphia, of which far less is known, even in the Presbyterian Church, than we might suppose would be

of discharging the duty. Other Boards, our own Board, must quickly follow the example. The church generally must reach this mark, or her work in the great Foreign field, now so inviting, and every year increasing, will greatly suffer. The toilers in the *home* field find their condition bitter enough, in the day of adversity and old age. It is harder still for those who have been exiles for years from their native land, and been taught and accustomed to speak in a strange tongue, and familiar only with very different modes of life, and who have passed through peculiar hardships, and often an enervating service.

We know no way so effective in bringing this matter to an intelligent comprehension, as to cite a case or two in illustration.

There returned from India some years since a missionary and his wife, both with health greatly impaired, and five young children. They had spent years in the service of the A. B. C. F. M. They took up their residence in the parish to which the writer then ministered. The straits to which that family were reduced were painful to witness. The question of daily bread was really an anxious one. The children could not go to Sunday-school, and were rudely hooted at in the streets, because of their shabby dress. It required ten years of weary waiting and hard struggling to conquer a condition of comfort. Remembering their bitter experience, is it a marvel that the sons of that missionary family grew up skeptics in religion itself as well as the missionary work?

Since this paper was begun a Letter has come to us from Central Turkey. It is from one of the most valued missionaries of the same Board resident there. As it relates to this subject, an extract is given: "It would be a good thing if the mission Boards would insure the lives of their missionaries. But as there seems no prospect of that we must think what we can do for ourselves. For my own part I am willing to economize every way and thus make sure of a little something for my family. The Lord seems to have put this thought into your hearts, and I am sure many a widow and orphan will pray for God's blessing to rest upon you when they come to receive the money which your wise forethought will

the case. This corporation was established in 1759, by a charter from the proprietary government of Pennsylvania, for "Relief of poor and distressed Presbyterian ministers, and of the poor and distressed widows and children of Presbyterian ministers." The latter object being deemed of greatest moment, received the first attention, and "a system was formed for providing an annuity for the widows and children of deceased clergymen. To give perfect security to the subscribers, and to make their investments largely productive, a considerable sum of money was collected, by donations from pious and charitable persons in Europe and America, and constituted what has been called the *Widows' Fund*." Subsequently the scope of the Society was enlarged so as to embrace annuities for aged ministers, and life insurance to the amount of \$3,000. In other words, the Society is a Life Insurance Company, on a benevolent foundation, existing for a benevolent purpose only, with its benefits restricted to the Presbyterian Church. The Trustees are men of high character, and its affairs are managed with prudence, economy and integrity.

put into their hands. I have been a missionary of the Board since 1855, and have never laid up a dollar . . . nor do I complain . . . I have a dear wife and three children for whom I feel bound to make some provision." His salary is but "\$700, \$40 of it goes for rent, and a little to benevolence." What can a man in such circumstances do for a "provision?" What if he die? What if health fail and he have to return? What if he wear out and years of inaction precede his release to a better life? Is there not *suffering* in store for him and his? suffering which no church or board has a right to lay upon a tried and faithful servant—suffering which a wise forethought might have averted?

In West Africa another missionary of the American Board has spent 27 years in heroic service. He is widely known and loved. He is about to return to his life's work in connection with the Presbyterian Board, "good for 20 years longer," he hopes. But at 53, it is natural to think of some resource in case health should fail, or the infirmities of age steal upon him, or the stroke of death leave his family without a protector. *How to do it?* is the anxious question he has raised in his own mind and in that of the writer. Not a dollar beyond his support has he received. He has no personal resources. He can do it in only one way—by *giving another turn to the screw*; by a still severer schooling in the science of economy and self-denial; by taking to himself another burden for the rest of his years. Will the Christian sentiment of this Missionary Age exact it of him? Will the American Church, whose missionaries do her such honor abroad, and contribute so largely to science, learning, and religion at home, suffer it? Will our own Board, into whose service this veteran has now entered, with all the fire of youth and the heroism of the cross, send him back uncared for? Until some general plan is adopted, are there not generous individuals, or individual churches, who will count it a privilege to bear the expense of a moderate provision for such?

Notwithstanding the advantages possessed by the Society, its efforts have been attended with only "very partial success." Only 122 ministers are now on the list of its beneficiaries. Its capital (\$100,000 in cash and all the while increasing) is comparatively useless. With a basis and facilities sufficient to confer signal blessings in the way of Relief, it is doing next to nothing for the object or the denomination.

Why is it? The excellent and honored brethren entrusted with this Fund, as well as the whole Presbyterian Church, have an interest in the answer given to this inquiry. There are reasons for the signal failure, and we believe it is not difficult to state them, and we shall not be thought censorious if we attempt it. Fidelity to the Cause requires it, and that we do it plainly and frankly.

One reason for its "very partial success" is doubtless the *general* one that we have stated—ministers are not themselves able, to any considerable extent, to bear the expense of Life Insurance in any form; and no system of Parish aid for this purpose has been as yet introduced. And yet the ratio of 122 to 4,500, is much less than 7,000 to 61,000, showing that other causes enter into the result.

A *second* reason is the *lack of business enterprise and activity* in the administration of the Society. It is left mainly to run itself. There is no one whose brains and energies are wholly given to it. Little effort is made to bring it to the notice of the churches and of ministers, and keep it before them; and to push out its lines of active agency and influence all over the field assigned it. During the last 25 years it has been brought into competition with a grand array of Insurance Companies, which are managed by men of the ablest practical wisdom of the country, all of them fully alive to their interests, worked by an extended and perfected system of agencies, and advanced by an amount of enterprise and outlay that marks a new era in the history of monetary institutions. Of course they outstrip and distance our Society. Companies with no larger capital than it has do a hundred times more business. We have a noble ship, strong, and freighted with a precious power; but it is *stranded*, and nothing less than a

"tidal wave" of new life and enterprise will lift it from the beach and speed it on its mission.

But a *third* and still more important reason is to be found in the "*conditions*" and "*rates*" of the Society. Some of these conditions are illiberal, arbitrary, impertinent—such as ordinary insurance companies would not think of exacting, and such as few ministers are willing to subscribe to. The Society's table rates are considerably higher than those of our ordinary insurance companies, organized on the "stock" basis; i. e., returning no part of the profits to the policy holders; and this is the basis of the Society. They are nearly as high as those of the "Mutual Life," "Equitable," and other leading companies worked on the "Mutual" plan, which give back all the profits in yearly dividends to the insured parties. The difference is as \$21 is to \$19.50 on the premium for \$1,000; while the Annuity rates are, on the average, nearly *fifty per cent.* above those of the Asbury and other safe companies. For instance, the Society charges \$122.72 for an annuity of \$100, for which the Asbury's rate is \$81. And so through the entire table.

Why is this? How shall we explain it? How justify it on moral or business principles? Life Insurance has been reduced to a science. The actual risk and the amount necessary to cover it, are ascertained facts, and on this knowledge rests the whole business of life insurance. There is no chance, no guess-work, about it. And the rates fixed by our companies are high enough to make the business profitable to "stock" companies, and to insure large dividends, varying from 25 to 70 per cent., to insurers in the older "Mutual" companies.

Now what motive is there for a Presbyterian minister to prefer this Society to ordinary companies, which offer him the same benefits at much less cost? And where is the advantage of a benevolent foundation, when purely business companies,* of unquestioned solvency and integrity, do bet-

* The "Equitable Assurance Society," of this city, is officered and manned almost entirely by Presbyterians, some of whose names are dear to every Presbyterian heart. Its prodigious exertions and generous policy have been rewarded in a most signal manner. Its relations to the Presbyterian Church, and to its Ministry in particular, have done it no harm. To

ter by the poor minister than our Presbyterian Annuity Society?

It is a pity, and a grave mistake, that such a Society should fail of its chief end. The Presbyterian Church, and the cause of Ministerial Relief, are the sufferers in consequence. The matter has been brought to the notice of the company, and an assurance given that a revision and change might be expected. We hope the change will be *radical*. It is demanded. The old stage-coach mode must give place to the steam-locomotive. Its capital is ample to do a large business, and do it safely. Its rates should be largely reduced—much below the ordinary insurance rates—as it has no interest on capital, or dividends to earn, its expenses are light, giving no commissions to agents, and its risks are confined to ministers, whose longevity is superior to that of any other class.

The O. S. Assembly of 1849 took action on the matter, and voted an annual appropriation of \$2,000 to it from the Publication Board. But nothing seems to have been done until 1856, when the first Report was made to the Assembly, showing that \$1,580 had been expended during the previous year. Nothing was done by the N. S. branch until 1865, when the Assembly warmly commended the object to the churches, and recommended annual collections in its behalf. Feeble at first, and entered upon with seeming hesitancy, the cause has gradually advanced to its present status. What that status is a few figures from the Report made to the last Assembly will show.

testify its sympathy with the latter, and its desire to extend to them all possible relief, it has entered into a business arrangement with the "Society for Promoting Life Insurance Among Clergymen," sending its documents to all their general agents with a request to cooperate with it, an arrangement which secures to any and all ministers a *liberal deduction* from regular rates, and brings the facilities for effecting insurance to their door.

The "Craftsmen" is also presided over by HON. E. A. LAMBERT, who has filled so many important trusts in the Presbyterian Church, to the satisfaction of all, and without a cent's pay; and many well-known Presbyterians are among its directors. This Company also has made most liberal terms with the same Society, for the benefit of ministers.

FREDERICK S. WINSTON, Esq., President of the "Mutual Life," was the first of all to express a warm interest in this scheme for Ministerial Relief, gave it the benefit of his counsel, and pledged his Company, the largest in the world, to a liberal and cooperative policy to further its object. And so have the grand old "Connecticut Mutual," the "Asbury," and other first-class companies.

Receipts from the entire church for the year (exclusive of additions to the Permanent Fund), \$50,652. On account of P. F., \$29,668; but \$25,000 of this was a legacy from the late J. C. Baldwin, Esq. Expended, \$52,689. Aided in all, 98 ministers, 130 widows, and 18 families of orphans. Present amount of Permanent Fund (as near as we can make it) about \$70,000.

Considering the great wealth and acknowledged liberality of the Presbyterian Church—the high character and large number of her ministers—and the fact that we have here the growth of twenty years of organized denominational effort, the results are certainly most meagre. The practical estimate put upon the cause is a very low one. Comparatively few of the churches have ever contributed to it. Note also the extent of the relief given—246 all told, and the average amount—a fraction over \$200—a sum which the Committee itself says, “can not, even with the most rigid economy, be an adequate support. It can do but little more than supplement the help derived from other sources, or leave them, as many of these have been left, to suffer.”

We wish we had space to reproduce the three Reports made to the Assembly, particularly that of the Standing Committee. The principles it urges, and the appeals it puts forth, are just and timely. The gift to the cause from four churches in Africa, one in China, and several among our Freedmen, is noted as a rebuke to the indifference of a multitude of able churches at home, which gave nothing. The Committee do not overstate the truth when they say: “On the attention or neglect which this important matter receives, may depend, in no small measure, the future prosperity or injury of the Church.” And well do they argue the cause in the following:

“Who more deserving of the Church’s tenderest care and constant sympathy, than men worn out with toil in the ministry, and the widows and orphans of such as have lived and labored to impart the true riches to others, while they themselves have died destitute of worldly good? Let an appeal go forth on this subject to all our churches. Make them acquainted with facts, which have saddened every heart familiar with them; the bare recital of which could not fail to give expansion to the benevolence of those already interested in this noble Cause; and which must awaken the tender solicitude, and secure a helping hand from those now

indifferent to it, because the matter has never as yet, in many cases, been properly set before the people by the pastors of the churches.

"We esteem him a generous, merciful man who makes provision for his domestic animals which have served him with fidelity for a score of years. The favorite steed is turned, in his days of decrepitude and uselessness, into a rich pasturage; and the period of his inactivity is made the most comfortable in his whole life. Are not our enfeebled brethren, our aged, sick, and suffering ministers of the Gospel, their desolate widows and orphan children, better than they? Shall we allow ourselves to be rebuked and reproved by the praiseworthy treatment which men of the world extend to irrational animals, in consequence of our willful neglect of those who are the especial objects of our divine Master's regards?"

We believe also with the Committee, "that there are many more entitled to help from this fund than have applied for assistance," and that the "number will continue to increase;" that many "have suffered in silence," "modesty and delicacy" keeping them from making their wants known; and that the relief afforded to applicants should be "materially increased."

IS A LARGE PERMANENT FUND DESIRABLE?

We are aware that our Denominational policy favors such a mode, and that the Memorial Fund Committee have embraced it in the objects specified. Nevertheless we are constrained to take an adverse view. There are objects which a fund might essentially aid. If the sum needed be a *definite* one—like the endowment of an institution, or scholarship—and a fund large enough to do it can be created, it is well. But when, as in this instance, the sum needed is indefinite, and the largest fund that is at all practicable, will yield only a tithe of what is needed, it will operate, inevitably, as a hindrance. Its *practical* effect will be just what a large surplus in the treasury of any of our Boards produces on the current liberality of the churches.

All experience bears out and emphasizes this remark. Funds left to individual churches to aid in the support of preaching have always proved hurtful, where no such aid was really needed. It is found more difficult to raise a part with than it would have been to raise the whole without it. The effect is not limited to the item of ministerial support, but extends to the cause of benevolence in general. It corrodes and, in time, all but kills the spirit of liberality. We have never known an exception. We could name a score of

churches which have been cursed by permanent funds. We have ministered to such a church, and traced and felt its baleful effects, and been forced to pray that the fund might be cast into the depths of the sea.

Suppose it were possible to increase this fund to \$300,000. The net annual proceeds of it would not exceed \$18,000—not a tenth of the sum necessary to provide generous relief. To secure that little, we have put in jeopardy the main sum. We have created a false dependence in the mind of the Church. That fund will take off the edge of every appeal. It will check the tide of annual contributions. It will furnish an excuse to hundreds of churches, and thousands of individuals, not to give at all. If we had this cause to plead before the churches, we should much sooner do it with the track clear; with no “fund” in bank or “surplus” in the treasury; with nothing to come between the conscience and heart of the church, and the obligation and appeal.

If this memorial year adds \$200,000 to our Permanent Fund, we shall feel that the cause of Ministerial Relief has not been advanced thereby. The generous gifts of the few will lessen the liberality of the many, in the coming years. As earnestly as we wish the prosperity of this cause, therefore, we hope the Five Million Fund will go to objects—and there are worthy and needful ones enough to absorb it all, and five times five millions—where it will do nothing but good: stimulate the spirit of liberality, and give a higher tone and broader development to the spiritual and benevolent economy of the Church.

If the moderate Fund we are likely to realize, were devoted to a *specific* part of the work—say to the *relief of ministers temporarily disabled*, and to families already receiving assistance, and not relied upon in the least for the *general* object—it might be turned to good account, and all mischief from it averted. There is another grave objection to the Fund principle. The wisdom of multiplying large permanent funds for religious purposes, controlled by a single ecclesiastical body, is more than questionable. The lessons of history on this point are neither few nor uncertain. Our own Church, in the sad period of its disruption, is not without an exper-

ience. There is a question above and beyond the matter of integrity and skill in the administration. There is danger—human nature being always the same—that such immense monetary interests will beget, sooner or later, worldly ambition, a secular and secularizing spirit and policy, and in the end corruption, distrust, and prejudice. Our excellent brethren of the Methodist Church are, at the present time, suffering severely from the operation of a large monetary interest; and the Presbyterian Church is not above the reach of a like experience. If the end sought can be as well attained without as with a large Fund, as a central and permanent power in our ecclesiastical affairs, prudent and sagacious business men, for the most part, will say, by all means dispense with it.

A FEW FIGURES AND ESTIMATES.

The cost of a just and liberal system of Ministerial Relief, on the principle now in vogue, is quite beyond the giving disposition, or the ability of our Church. That principle makes an enormous demand, which has to be repeated each year; and the cause is subject to great uncertainty, and a thousand contingencies. The enlightened sentiment, and the practical business sagacity of the age, condemn the principle. No business man, no head of a family, would think of adopting it as the best mode of providing for the future necessities of himself and those for whom he is responsible.

The Minutes of the Assembly of 1870 give 4,576 licensed ministers in our communion. According to well-established tables of mortality, 1826 of them will die before reaching the age of sixty. At a moderate estimate, 1,000 of them will leave families in dependent circumstances. The number of "deceased ministers'" households who have a claim on this fund *at the present time* is not greatly short of this. The balance, 2,750, will live beyond 60; 1,800 of them beyond 70; and nearly 900 to 80 and upwards. As few pastorates, in these times, are continued much beyond 60, provision, as the rule, should be made for them all, available at this period, or at 65, the latest.

It is not difficult, from this data, to estimate the cost of providing for these two classes, leaving the "disabled" under 60 to be relieved from the Permanent Fund. If we fix the

amount at the moderate average sum of \$300, we shall then require, annually, \$1,125,000; i. e., for the 1,000 families of deceased ministers, needing help, and the 2,750 ministers, who survive the limit of active service. No one will admit that such an amount can be realized. If the whole of the "Five Million" were added to our Permanent Fund, and \$100,000 a year were realized from donations and contributions, we should have but *one-third* of it. And yet the Presbyterian church should never rest until she has done *as much* as this.

Now let us estimate the cost of an equal provision for an equal number, by another mode, that of Life Insurance, Endowment, and Annuity. The annual average investment of \$100 by 3,750 parishes will aggregate \$375,000, just *one-third* the sum needed by the other mode. For that amount, each of these parishes may secure a standing insurance on the life of its pastor for \$5,000, and in addition an Annuity, ranging from \$100 to \$1,000, according to age, averaging at least \$300, available to him at 60 or 65. The families of the 1,000 ministers who die before 60 will be sure each of \$5,000, and the same sum will be realized by each family of the remainder as fast as death removes the head of it.*

* We must refer the reader to the Documents of the "Society," already named, for the *modus operandi*. We suppose a case, to make the mode intelligible.

A Parish settles a pastor. In the "Call" it promises him \$1,000 salary a year, and \$100 as a Relief Provision. The latter is not paid to him but invested by the Parish for his benefit, in either of two ways suggested. First, in a policy in a sound insurance company. Assuming his age to be 30, the \$100 will insure his life for \$5,000 on the "single year" plan, and buy an annuity of \$50. On the "ordinary life" plan for *nearly* \$5,000 with a participation in the profits, which will become a source of income to him in future years. If disposed to add a little to the \$100 they secure him an "endowment policy" of \$5,000, payable when he attains to 60, which will yield him a sure and increasing income after a brief season.

Or, secondly, if a cheaper mode is preferred, one we believe equally secure, while more flexible and simple, and made the basis of our estimate in the text—the parish may become one of 500 parishes associated in a class already organized and partly filled, for the mutual relief of their pastors, each paying \$10 when a death occurs. By this mode the provision is secured at the *actual cost*, and the \$100 will cover the life of the pastor for \$5,000 and secure in addition a liberal annuity, if he should live to need it. If the process begins at 30, in ten years about \$450 annuity will be made sure to him at 65.

Now what is secured by this system? What are its practical effects? If the *first* form is adopted by the Parish, \$5,000 is made sure to their pastor's family if he dies at any time in their service. If he lives and continues in it, he derives a growing income from his policy as he advances in

Which system shows the best results? Which is the least expensive? Which the most practicable? We believe it simply impossible, in the way of charity and by the existing mode, ever to meet the full demands of this cause. But put it on the broader basis of moral and business obligation, and make it a part of the ordinary Parish arrangement for the support of the ministry, and the work will, in time, be done. The purchase of an endowment or an annuity for the pastor when he retires, or an insurance on his life as a standing provision, at a small annual cost, maturing at regular intervals, and provided for by the parish as other pecuniary obligations are, would accomplish what no available resources, applied as now, will ever effect.

An interest of such magnitude, and so vital to the ministry and its work, should not be left to mere impulse and sympathy, or to fitful and contingent action. It should be as much a matter of definite understanding and business arrangement between pastor and people, the missionary, secretary, or professor and the Board he serves, as the item of salary. What the parish might fail to do for a general charity, it might be educated to do as a matter of duty, interest, and affection. Let every parish that is able adopt the system, and the wealthy aid the feeble in doing it, and in a few years ample foundations will be laid for the relief of the great body of our ministers.

THE TRUE IDEA AND PLAN.

We have already indicated what we conceive these to be. Not a "charity" for the relief of extreme cases of indigence and suffering, but a liberal and general provision for the pro-

years. If he should be dismissed, say at the end of ten years, he takes a *paid-up* policy for an equitable proportion, which will still yield him an income, and has the benefit of whatever dividends or annuities have accrued up to that time. If the *second* mode is adopted the same provision is made for the family, and a generous provision for the minister himself in his old age.

Now is there a parish able to give a salary of \$1,000, that is not able to add \$100 to it for this object, which so immediately concerns both parish and pastor? If it may be done by *one* parish without serious difficulty, why not by 1,000 or 2,000, or even a greater proportion of our 4,250? And the system is admirably adapted to enlist the sympathy and aid of the *wealthy* churches in behalf of the *feeble*. Any parish contributing, say \$1,000 to the Society will have the privilege of naming the ten churches, or pastors, or missionaries, or professors, or secretaries, who are to be provided for by it.

fession, on the basis of obligation, which shall protect them from such a condition. Not a Permanent Fund, a general treasury, and ecclesiastical agencies to collect and disburse the means of relief; but parochial action and arrangement, taking the form of regular business, under the control of the board of Elders or Trustees. Not by the direct application of funds to relieve existing distress, but mainly on the basis of annual investments to meet a future need.

Of all the institutions devised by practical wisdom and scientific benevolence, Life Insurance stands preëminent for usefulness. Its rapid growth among us is evidence of the estimation in which it is held and the confidence reposed in it. It is adopted by all classes in the community; by our most sagacious and experienced business and monetary men, as well as by others. It has drawn to its management thousands of the best financial and practical minds of the country, and among them many whom the Church delights to honor. It is in no sense an experiment. It has a solid scientific and monetary basis. It is protected by numerous legal safeguards. It has been developed and built up by thirty years of patient labor, and most liberal expenditure of means and enterprise.

All the advantages and facilities which this benignant system has created, are available to us for Ministerial Relief. And none need them more than clergymen. No class of men are, in a pecuniary sense, so dependent on life and health as they. Through a National Society, chartered and organized for the express purpose, and adopted by leading Insurance Companies as a General Agent to work for the exclusive benefit of ministers, *they can secure its benefits at considerable less cost than any other class.* The leading managers of this great Institution, very many of whom are Christian men, cherish a generous sympathy for them, and by a liberal concession, which may possibly be enlarged if the present one is appreciated, have given practical evidence of it. The important question for the American Clergymen and the American church to consider and decide now is: *Whether they can afford to forego such advantages and facilities, as Providence has created and put at their service, for the attainment of a great good?*

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1. The bearings of this subject on *the due increase of the Presbyterian Ministry in future years*, are direct and important. That there is a *deficiency*, at the present time, of able and efficient ministers, in our own branch of the church, and in the church at large, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, is known to all intelligent observers. That there is a large number of *unemployed* ministers, is readily conceded, and there always will be, as in every other profession, and in all the industries of life; and there would be if the total number were much less than it is. Some are of entirely too sluggish a nature to keep up with this fast age; others are not enough in sympathy with it to work advantageously in it; while a considerable number have entirely mistaken their calling, and are to be pitied rather than blamed. But of active, energetic, competent, acceptable ministers, appreciating and abreast of the times, the supply is greatly less than the demand. The deficiency really exists and is severely felt already both in the home and the foreign field. The cry is for *men*, but they are not to be had. The unparalleled growth and development of our country, and the position and relations of the Presbyterian Church to it, will, in the coming years, make large and rapidly increasing demands upon our ministerial force. Our Home Mission Secretaries, in their recent visit to our Synods, stated that if the *men* could be had they could plant "one hundred" new out-posts at important points on our frontiers. But where are the men to come from? The "money" question, about which so much anxiety and alarm has been expressed, is as nothing compared with this. Money can be supplied in a day. It will be no strange event if a large "surplus" should be reported to the next Assembly. The stirring of the popular heart and the special pressure upon the liberality of God's people, occasioned by the memorial thank-offering, will not tend to lessen but rather to increase the volume of our stated and ordinary gifts. Such a result would be contrary both to the philosophy of things, and the experience of the past.

Are not our glorious Reunion, and Memorial of it, to bear fruit? Are not new churches to be planted, new church edi-

fices built, new fields, at home and abroad, explored and occupied, new enterprises pioneered and established, and the whole Christian Work of the Church greatly enlarged, as a part of the obligation and the blessing? And will not all this call for additional *men*, in much greater numbers than ever before, and far in excess of the supply, judging from present prospects? Considering the rapid growth of the denomination in membership, wealth, and influence, in the area of the field which it covers, and in its facilities of Christian enterprise; and considering the unparalleled advance and development of our country and its free institutions, and their influence upon the civilized world—never so marked and wonderful as during the last decade of years—the fact that we have but 541 “Candidates” for the ministry, all told, many of them still in the early stage of their training, and only a small per cent. of the whole available each year for service—there is certainly ground for solicitude.

The absence of a general Revival of Religion for many years now, will account, in part, for a deficiency here which touches every vital interest. But another potent reason, beyond a question, relates to the *pecuniary* side of the matter. Looking at the Gospel Ministry from the stand-point of *this world*, it never had so few attractions to a young man of spirit, talent, and culture, as at the present time. On the one hand life is stirred to its very center by new activities and successes on a scale never dreamed of in former days. On the other hand—there is no use in disguising the fact—there are causes not a few at work, which render the Ministry, as a profession, more difficult and undesirable—more precarious and oftener unsuccessful; more exacting demands are made upon it; more failures occur in it; more frequent breaking down in health is experienced; settlements are more difficult; the term of eligibility is shorter, and the ratio of unemployed ministers is larger; the relative pay is less and the work harder; while there is far less social and literary distinction in the profession than in former years. And our young men are not slow to perceive these things; and, “men of like passions with others,” they are naturally and strongly influenced by them. There is required a *higher* degree of

grace and spirit of self-denial in a young man, to make choice of the Ministry under such circumstances than in former times. And the danger is—nay, the result is inevitable, unless we guard and strive against it—that the profession will *deteriorate* in the elements of talent, enterprise, energy, and high order of endowments, even if it be kept full in point of number. And not one word of complaint has the Church a right to utter, because the flower of her converted youth decline to choose the ministry as their life-calling, when she considers the insufficient salaries she decrees them, and the pitiable and suffering condition to which the ordinary accidents of life will inevitably consign them and all dependent upon them.

The proportion of unemployed and retired ministers is now much larger than it was a generation ago. And it will grow larger still, from the operation of causes only as yet partially developed. We are fast tending to the limit which God affixed to the public exercise of the priestly office in the Jewish church. To have attained to "fifty" is, in our day, to have lost nearly all chance of an eligible settlement or position in the pastoral office. And there is nothing gained by finding fault with the times. It is wiser to accept the existing state of things and shape our work and policy to it. The steady aim of every man who devotes himself to the sacred office must be to do up the public work of his life before that period arrives. The most effective ministries ever exercised in the Christian church have frequently been *short*. Even our Saviour did up the personal mighty work of human Redemption on earth at thirty-three! It is possible so to crowd a period of 20 or 25 years with holy activities as to make it more effective than if spread over double that period. Hence the shortening of the term of active public service is not an unmixed evil. It may be turned into an advantage.

But then it devolves a *new responsibility* upon the Church. Every principle of honor, religion, and humanity binds her to look after this army of retired veterans. Can she, after they have served her with their choicest gifts, and condensed into the short period of active service allowed them the energies of a life-time, on a bare sustenance, allow them

thereafter to wander homeless, and to suffer, through their declining years? If she fails to respond, and respond liberally, to the new demands made upon her by the new order of things; if she merely proffers a stinted "charity" in the few cases of actual suffering which are forced into public notice, and does nothing to protect the thousands who are exposed to the same suffering condition, if not already "in silence" drinking the bitter cup; if she stretches out no friendly hand to point the hundreds of discharged veterans, all covered with the scars of the moral battle-fields, even as the hand of Jehovah pointed the Jewish priest when he had finished his work at the Temple, to a "city of refuge," built and provisioned by his kindly forethought—she will certainly find it more and more difficult to recruit the ranks of the ministry, especially from the class which the age preëminently needs.

2. If the work of Ministerial Relief is worth doing at all, it *is worth doing well and by the best methods which study and experience are able to suggest.* We trust we have shown that it can be done more acceptably to the beneficiaries, and more economically and thoroughly on the part of the denomination, on a simple business basis, by methods and thorough business relations established directly in and by each Parish, and done in the way of life insurance, endowment and annuity, or on the Parish Association principle, than by any other method yet devised.

The last General Assembly made an important move in the right direction in the appointment of a large and able Committee to consider the whole subject of our Benevolent Agencies. A thorough revision is called for by the exigencies of the case. We have quite too much machinery; it is becoming onerous. Our Boards are too numerous for convenience, economy, or utility. A wise process of revision and consolidation will help us. Fewer secretaries; less ministerial force absorbed in monetary matters, and more of the business skill and talent of our Laymen (what Church can show a nobler array?) enlisted in this department of our work, would be a gain. If the matter of Ministerial Relief, which is entirely pecuniary in character, involving no question in

doctrine or polity, were removed, in its practical management, from the sphere of the Assembly's duties, and entrusted to a benevolent business Agency, specially adapted to the nature of the work, constituted in part by its own appointment, and sustaining intimate relations with it, some relief would be afforded to the Assembly, to the other Boards, and to pastors who find it well-nigh impossible to find room for so many charitable objects. Under the auspices of the Assembly, and with the coöperation of our Presbyteries and Sessions, the plan of Parish Relief Provision could be rapidly worked among the churches. Sooner or later we believe such a course will be adopted. Is not the present the fit time at least to consider it?

3. This cause suffers, more than any other, on account of *the extreme delicacy of ministers*. We honor the feeling; but it may be indulged too far. The question rises above the sphere of personal relations to it. It is a matter of obligation on the part of the Church. It concerns her duty, the honor of religion, the efficiency of the ministry, and the success of our benevolent work, as really as the comfort and interest of the pastor. And there is no sufficient reason for excluding it from the pulpit, or for handling it daintily. The pastor should educate his people up to their duty in this as well as in every other particular of obligation. It is a grave mistake to let it alone, because of his possible personal relations to it. His people would honor him for the fearless and thorough discharge of his pulpit obligation, in spite of delicate relations; and God, we believe, would bless it.

Finally, impressed with the view of the subject presented in this paper, the minds of a number of thoughtful and philanthropic gentlemen, lay and clerical, have been patiently at work for a year past to devise and perfect a system of Ministerial Relief, applicable to the whole profession, based on sound business principles, adapted to the varied and ever-changing circumstances of ministerial life and work, adequate to the need to be supplied, and maintained and worked as a purely benevolent institution. These gentlemen called to their aid several eminent actuaries, and sought, by correspondence and circulars, counsel and suggestion from leading

minds in various parts of the country. As the results of their study and effort, a Charter has been obtained, a Society organized under it, plans carefully matured, and the simple, uncostly machinery needed to work them, put in motion.

The Society is not sectarian but Christian and broadly catholic. Representative men from the several leading denominations—Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian*—compose its "Corporate Trustees," and its board of Managers, among whom are business gentlemen of the highest standing in point of experience, sagacity, and responsibility. Putting itself in correspondence with our best insurance companies and securing from them important concessions in favor of clergymen, and establishing direct relations with each parish and minister, affording them the best available terms and facilities at actual cost; interfering in no way with any private or denominational interest or agency—this Society aims to do a long-neglected and much-needed work in behalf of our American Clergy, and to do it *gratuitously*. If the Society at its approaching annual meeting shall deem it best to adopt another feature still, which has been proposed for adoption, giving a broader scope and wider application to its lines of agencies, we shall feel that nothing is wanting to complete the system. And sure we are that all good men, when they come to understand the motives which actuate its founders, and to study and comprehend the principles and modes which it proposes, will wish it success; and "many a widow and orphan," and many an aged or retired minister, when they shall come to reap the harvest which it sows, "will pray for God's blessing to rest upon it."

* The Presbyterian Church is represented by *James Brown, Esq.*, a Trustee and President of the Society. *Wm. Adams, D.D. LL.D.*, Trustee and on Executive Com. *John D. Sherwood, Esq.*, Trustee, and a Vice-President. *J. W. Weir, Esq.*, of Harrisburg, Trustee, and *Rev. J. M. Sherwood*, one of the editors of this *Review*, Secretary.

ART. IX.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Freely translated from the German of W. F. Gess, with many additions, by J. A. REUBELT, D. D. Prof. in Indiana University. Andover Press. pp. 456. The work of Gess is well known in German theology as a careful attempt, on Biblical grounds, to construct the doctrine of the Person of Christ, in such a way as to hold fast to the unity of Christ's consciousness, as well as of Christ's person. He adopts unreservedly the theory of the *Kenosis* ("the self-emptying," taken in a literal sense), which has been advocated by many Lutheran divines—in recent times by Hofmann, Liebner, Thomasius and others. His work in five sections, treats of the Eternal Son of God; the Son upon Earth; the Glorified Son of God; the Historical Development of the Son of God; the Incarnation of the Son and the Trinity. The translator adds appendices on the History of the Doctrine, and on the origin of the Human Soul—the latter from Delitzsch.

The translator says, in his preface, that he has not merely translated Gess, but that he "has sometimes also modified the text, so that *what is now offered exhibits the translator's Christology*." He gives no hint as to the extent of these alterations; nor have we now time to make the comparison. But we think that he has misjudged in making any alterations in the text. Our chief interest is to know what Gess taught. The best way was to give that, and then in notes to present the translator's views.

Dr. Reubelt thinks, that the whole Christology of the church in this country needs revision. He seems to us to exaggerate both the need and the difficulties. The "Nestorianism," of which he complains, is not in the Confessions, nor yet to a large extent in the best systems, but rather in popular and vague modes of speech and of interpretation—as if in Christ there was both a man and a God, a double personality,—which of course is an error, and condemned by the church.

The Theology of Christ from his Own Words. By JOSEPH P. THOMPSON. Scribner & Co. pp. 295. The theme proposed by Dr. Thompson in this work—the truths of religion as taught by Christ himself, is treated more or less fully in most systems of Biblical Theology, and is well worthy of separate investigation. It is here presented in a popular, and at times in a rhetorical form, after the manner of discourses rather than in the method of scientific treatises. Thus it is adapted for wider use than a more scholastic treatise would be. All the main points of our Lord's teaching are presented, divided into nineteen chapters, each of which is devoted to some main head of doctrine—as ch. iv., the New Birth; ch. v., Salvation through the Death of Christ; ch. vi., Salvation limited only by Unbelief; and after these, ch. vii., the Nature of Religion; ch. viii., the Spirituality of Worship, etc. Such a volume is of great use as showing that the doctrine of the apostles grew naturally and necessarily out of the doctrines of Christ, and that if we accept Christ's words, we can not deny the apostolic teaching. The fact, too, that the great central truths of our faith are here divested of technical phrasology, and present-

ed more in their native simplicity, gives them increased power. An appendix discusses the genuineness of the Gospel of John, gives some account of Van Oosterzee's Biblical Theology, etc.

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By JOHN A. BROADUS D.D., LL.D., Prof. in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. New York: Sheldon & Co. This Treatise gives the results of the author's experience as a teacher of Homiletics for ten years. His "chief indebtedness for help has been to Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, and to Whately and Vinet"—with frequent references to other recent writers on the subject. His work treats of the subject in four Parts: 1. Materials of Preaching; 2. Arrangement of a Sermon; 3. Style; 4. Delivery. Among the many treatises which have of late been published on this important subject, this of Dr Broadus will take an honorable place for orderly arrangement, appropriate suggestions, and practical worth. Increased attention is needed to this important part of the ministerial work.

Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the last Century. A contribution to the History of Theology. By the Rev. JOHN HUNT, M. A., author of "An Essay on Pantheism." Vol. I Strahan & Co., London. This volume presents us with a survey of the religious literature of England from the Reformation to the close of the seventeenth century. As a matter of necessity, this survey, within the limits assigned, is rapid and concise. The author devotes his attention mainly to controverted points of doctrine and discipline. On some of these he presents facts that have been carefully collected, often from sources not readily accessible in England, and much less so in this country. The change, for instance, which took place in the theology of the English Church after the Synod of Dort is quite fully set forth and explained; so also the controversies concerning Episcopacy and Baptism, as well as non-conformity, are passed in review in connection with the publications of the time.

Much has been omitted which the reader might have anticipated would be inserted here. Writers of no little eminence are passed over in a few lines, while others are omitted altogether. The author has given us very brief biographical or critical notices of authors, and very frequently has neglected to give us the date of their publications. He presumes on his reader's acquaintance with the subject, beyond what the fact generally will warrant. Still he has endeavored to present a fair and impartial view of the subjects discussed, and rarely betrays his own doctrinal leanings or sympathies. Sometimes, however, he uses language that will grate upon the feelings of some of his readers. For instance, speaking of Richard Baxter, he says, "he had parted with Calvinism, but he had not entirely freed himself from its influence. He looked upon the world as a gaol where all were condemned, and hell the gallows to which all were doomed to be led out." Such language would have been more in place on the pages of Mr Leckey's volumes. Still the work is valuable, and indicates much and patient investigation, while its general tone is unexceptionable. The same field, however, might be retraversed, and many would account the gleanings even richer than Mr. Hunt's harvest. He has not exhausted his subject, and

yet it is perhaps but just to say that had he even approximately done so, he would have produced a book less readable, and one that perhaps would have sunk to neglect by its own bulk.

The Early Years of Christianity. By E. D. PRESSENSÉ, D. D., author of *Jesus Christ, his Times, Life and Work*. Translated by Annie Harwood. The Apostolic Era. Charles Scribner & Co. The publication and wide circulation of Renan's writings have led the author of this volume, in the series to which it belongs, to retrace the path pursued by his brilliant countryman, and give us the facts of history without that coloring of romance by which they have been obscured or misrepresented. We have here a sketch of the Apostolic Era, in which disquisitions on the doctrines and usages of the early church are interwoven with the narrative, while the career of the leading characters of the age is graphically sketched, and the circumstances of their lives, or the training to which they had been subjected, are passed in review.

The author has performed his task with ability and conscientious fidelity. He wisely combats error by the presentation of the truth, and he has produced a work which combines a popular and pleasing style with the higher merits of instructive history and discussion. General readers may be attracted by it, while it will repay the perusal of students familiar with the outline of the progress of the Early church. The author has not a word to say in behalf of a complex ecclesiasticism. As a French Protestant he has no sympathy with it. Some may even think that he depreciates the amount of the formal element which existed in the Apostolic church. He is emphatic on the parity of the ministry, and the common or interchangeable use of *Bishop* and *Elder* in the New Testament. His doctrinal expositions are, as might be anticipated from his known position and views, of a highly evangelical character, and yet are marked by less rigidity or severity of tone than they might have exhibited in different circumstances. The book has the high merit of being adapted to the present state of theological learning, while the notes appended at the close are pertinent and judicious.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.—v. vi. 1870. It is hardly a venturesome thing to predict that some of the choicest commentaries on the Scriptures will be dug up out of the soil of Palestine. Facts in stone and marble will explain and illustrate texts that have perplexed generations of sages. When a Christian government holds Syria, and Mohammedan prejudice is dissipated or held in check, then the book of antiquity will be fully opened and its revelations will be a new lexicon to the Bible. Already we have peeped into some of its pages, gained a tantalizing glimpse at its wonders through the chinks of Mussulman bigotry, and even this has enriched our Biblical literature. The explanation of Seetser, Burkhardt, Irby and Mangles, Robinson and Smith, Van der Velde and others in this century, have made the geography and topography of Palestine a new department of Biblical science, and now Wilson and Warren have added the spade to the compass and measuring-tape, and are constructing a hypo-geography that bids fair to be ultimately richer in its

results than all before. An article of interest might be written on this fascinating subject, but we can only give room to a cursory notice.

The Palestine Exploration Fund is a Society organized five years ago in England for the accurate and systematic investigation of the Archæology, Topography, Geology and Physical Geography, Natural History, Manners and Customs of the Holy Land, for Biblical Illustration. The Society is under the patronage of the Queen, and presided over by the Archbishop of York. Men like Dr. Angus, the Duke of Argyll, Mr. Deutsch, Mr. Layard, Mr. John MacGregor, Dr. McLeod, Dr. Pusey, Sir Henry Rawlinson, and Dr. William Smith, are coadjutors in the work. Captain Wilson, and Lieutenant (now Captain) Warren, both of the Royal Engineers, have been the active explorers, the hands of the Society, while Mr. E. H. Palmer, a man of remarkable fitness for Orientalizing, has been their indefatigable assistant. The Society published an account of Capt. Wilson's Expedition of 1866, and Lieut. Warren's report for 1868, together with his account of Excavations at Jericho, before they commenced issuing a regular "Quarterly Statement." This Quarterly Statement has now reached its sixth number. The last two numbers have only lately been received.

They contain the complete literature of the famous Moabitic Stone, found by Mr. Klein among the ruins of Dibon, including the letters of Messrs. Grove, Deutsch, Ganneau and Klein. Through the energy and tact of Capt. Warren and Mr. Ganneau, (connected with the French consulate at Jerusalem), squeezes of the inscription and some of the fragments of the stone (broken by Arab jealousy) were secured. The translation of the Count de Vogüé is given, with the comments of Mr. Deutsch and Mr. Ganneau.

The inscription was in the Græco-Phœnician alphabet. Among the many revisals of the translation one published in the *Christian Union* of this city, (Aug. 13, 1870), by Dr. Alexander Meyrowitz, deserves attention.

[An interesting paper in the *North British Review* for November gives a new and improved revisal of the translation, which we subjoin, with an outline of the chief points of the inscription.

"Before proceeding further, it is right to enumerate the principal pamphlets and articles which have been published regarding the Moabite Stone. This will save the trouble of constant references.

The first to make the inscription generally known to European scholars was M. Clermont-Ganneau in his letter to the Comte de Vogüé, entitled *La Stèle de Mesa roi de Moab*, 896 *avant J. C.*, dated Jerusalem, 16 January, 1870, with a note at the end by M. de Vogüé, dated Paris, 5 February, 1870. This has been succeeded by an article by M. Ganneau in the *Revue Archéologique* for March and June of the present year. Of the two fac-similes which accompany these essays, that appended to the latter is naturally by far the more complete. A short article by M. Renan in the *Journal des Débats* for the 25th of February did not add much to our knowledge. Then appeared a notice of M. Ganneau's first pamphlet, by M. J. Derenbourg, in the *Journal Asiatique* for January-February, and a longer article by the same scholar in the *Revue Israélite* of April 8, based upon M. Ganneau's revised copy. Among German scholars the first to take the field was Professor Schlottmann of Halle, whose excellent pamphlet is dated March 15. He also published his translation in the *Times* for May 5, and gave a revised version in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* xxiv. Bd. I. und II. Heft, dated May 13. Meantime the inscription had been discussed by

Professor Ewald in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* for April 20; and a complete translation had been attempted by Dr. Neubauer in the April number of Frankel and Grätz's *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, agreeing closely with one which appeared in the *Times* of March 27. The well-known Jewish scholar Dr. Geiger of Berlin also wrote upon the subject in the above mentioned number of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*; and finally Professor Noeldeke of Kiel published his admirable treatise, dated April 6, of which he himself wrote a short notice in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* for May 4. Of other articles which have appeared in France and Germany, we have seen only that in the *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* for April 16, written by Professor Haug of Munich, and one by Professor Schrader of Giessen in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for June 1.

In the following translation, words, or portions of words, supplied by conjecture, are printed in italics. Words within brackets are added merely to convey more distinctly the meaning of the original.

1. I, Mesha, son of Kemosh-gad, king of Moab, *the Di-*
2. *bonite*—my father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reign-
3. ed after my father. And I made this high-place for Kemosh in
4. Korchoh, a high *place of de-*
5. liverance, because he delivered me from all enemies and let me look
6. [with pleasure] upon [the destruction of] all my haters. *There arose*
7. Omri, king of Israel, and he oppressed Moab many days, because
8. Kemosh was angry with his
9. land. And his son [*i.e.* Ahab] succeeded him, and he too said, "I will
10. oppress Moab." In my days he said *this*,
11. but I looked upon [the ruin of] him and his house, and Israel perished
12. for ever. And Omri had taken possession of the *plain*
13. of Medeba, and dwelt in it; and *they oppressed Moab, he and his son,*
14. *forty years; but looked*
15. upon him [*i.e.* Moab] Kemosh in my days. And I built [*i.e.* restored or
16. fortified] Baal-Meon, and constructed it in the moat (?); and I *built*
17. Kiryathaim. And the men of Gad were dwelling in the land of *Ata-*
18. *roth* from of old, and the king of *Is-*
19. *rael* had built for himself *the city*; and I fought against the city, and
20. took it, and slew all *the inhabitants of*
21. the city. [as] a [pleasing] sight to Kemosh and to Moab; and I car-
22. ried off thence the. . . . *of Yahveh*, and drag-
23. ged it [or them] before Kemosh at Kerioth. And I made dwell in it
24. [viz. Ataroth] the people of Shiran and the people of . . .
25. M-ch-rath (?). And Kemosh said to me, "Go, take Nebo from Israel;"
26. *and I*
27. went by night, and fought against it from the dawning of the morn-
28. ing until mid-day, and I
29. took it, and slew the whole [population] of it, seven thousand . . .
30. . . . for to Ashtor-Kemosh I *had devoted it*; and I
31. took away thence *the*
32. *vessels of Yahveh*, and dragged them before Kemosh. And the king
33. of Israel [*i.e.* Ahaziah] built
34. Yahaz, and abode in it whilst he was fighting against me; but Kemosh
35. drove him out before me [*i.e.* *Israelly*, before my face];
36. and I took of Moab two hundred men, all his headmen (?), and I led
37. them up (?) to Yahaz, and took it.
38. In addition to Dibon, I built Korchoh, the wall of the woods and
39. the wall of
40. the mound; and I built its gates, and I built its towers; and
41. I built the palace; and I made the reservoirs for rain-water (?)
42. in the midst of
43. the city. And there was not a cistern in the midst of the city, in
44. Korchoh; and I said to the

25. whole people, "Make for yourselves each a cistern in his house." And I cut the moat for Korchoh with [the labour of] *the captives*
26. of Israel. I built Arzer; and I made the road over the Arnon.
27. I [re]built Beth-Bamoth, for it had been pulled down. I built Bezer for
28. men of Dibon, fifty [in number] for all Dibon was submission [submissive to me]. And I
29. in the cities (?), which I added to the land. And I built.
30. and Beth-Diblathaim and Beth-Baal-Meon; and I took up (?) thither the
31. the land. And Horonaim, there dwelt in it. B
32. And Kemosh said to me, "Go down, fight against Horonaim." And I
33. Kemosh in my days. And
34. year (?)

The Inscription may be divided, as to its subject, into five sections. In the following commentary these are indicated in their places while the continuous numbering of the lines of the inscription is preserved.

I. Dedication of the high-place constructed by king Mesha at Dibon to his god Kemosh.

II. Retrospect: the oppression of Moab by Omri and his son Ahab; his deliverance by Mesha.

III. The campaign of Mesha against Israel.

IV. The public works of king Mesha

V. Mesha's expedition against Horonaim.—EDITORS.]

These Quarterly Statements also contain a deeply interesting account of the remains upon the summit of Hermon, 9,000 feet above the sea, where a shrine probably existed in the earliest ages. The ruined temples around Hermon (generally small Ionic structures *in antis*) are carefully described, as well as those in the Buka'a.

Capt. Warren carried his party into the Lebanon region, in the summer of 1869, for the sake of health, but did not remain idle. He spent the last months not only in the work just alluded to, of exploring Hermon, but in examining the Lebanon country as far north as the romantic Afska, the site of the temple of Venus, destroyed by Constantine. Dr. Landreczki's account of his visit to El Medyeh and Tibueh, and his supposed identification of the former with the Maccabean Modin, ruins of whose great mausoleum he finds in the Kubâr el-Jahûd, and Mr. Ganneau's letter on the Stone Zoheleth, (1 Kings i, 9) are interesting contributions to the fifth number. Mr. Palmer's careful letters, and the itinerary of the expedition to the East of the Jordan, furnish a feast to the student who explores in his study with another's eyes. But after all the interest centres in Capt. Warren's work around the Haram Area at Jerusalem, which has revealed the immense height of the Temple walls, (160 feet), the depth of the Tyropæon valley, rock-cut aqueducts and cisterns, the bridge-connections of Tivîn, secret vaulted passages; in short, old Jerusalem; so that Captain Wilson's suggestion may soon be verified, and we shall have an accurate map of Jerusalem in our Saviour's day. The tower at the north-east angle of the so-called pool of Bethesda, familiar to all who have visited Jerusalem, is found to be 180 feet in height, 135 of which are buried in the ground! At the bottom of this were found painted Phœnician characters. A vast wall has been struck outside of the perpendicular line of the eastern wall of the

Haram, suggesting that the present wall may have been moved inwards. But these are but the beginnings. All Christendom should help this movement. An American Committee of co-operation has been appointed, and Americans can, through this channel, aid the Palestine Exploration Fund.

H. C.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D. D., Hulsean Prof. of Divinity. Cambridge. Andover Press. This is a reprint of the Second English edition of the original; and the printing is done with Mr. Draper's usual excellence, so that the book is at least equal to the English edition. The references to Winer's Grammar are adapted to Prof. Thayer's revised edition.

For a scholar's use Dr. Lightfoot's commentary is invaluable. He and Bishop Ellicott worthily supplement each other. The revised text is one of the best recent contributions to a complete text of the Greek New Testament, and the criticisms on the text are concise and to the point.

Besides the critical discussion of the text, the Introduction, Dissertations and extended Notes on controverted questions cover most of the points demanded in a commentary. In this edition the "Notes," or rather the Dissertations, are conveniently appended to the Text. Among the topics thus distinctly discussed are: The Galatian People; the Churches at Galata; the Fate of the Epistle (between 2 Cor. and Romans); its Genuineness, Character and Contents; Were the Galatians Celts or Teutons? The Brethren of the Lord; St. Paul and the Three. These are in the Introduction and Dissertations. The appended Notes are on Paul's Sojourn in Arabia; his Visits to Jerusalem; the Name and Office of Apostle; the Various Readings in Gal. ii, 5; iv, 25; v, 1, etc.; the Words denoting "Faith," and the Faith of Abraham; Paul's Infirmary in the Flesh (epilepsy?); Hagar and Sarah. etc.

On doctrinal questions this commentary is not so full, nor so explicit, as on historical and exegetical topics. The philology of "Faith" is investigated; but comparatively little is said of that doctrine of Justification by Faith, which Luther, on the basis of this epistle, made the war-cry of the Reformation, and which Wieseler has so admirably developed in his commentary.

An Introduction to the New Testament. By FREDERICK BLEEK. Translated by REV. WM. URWICK. Vol. II. Among the various Introductions to the Scriptures that of Bleek is distinguished by its candor, clearness and serviceable arrangement. Excellently edited by his son, J. F. Bleek (recently deceased), from his father's manuscript Lectures, it has about it something of the freshness of the spoken word. Almost any well-instructed person would read it with satisfaction. It has also the merit of a positive and reverential tone towards the Scriptures while it makes use of all the lawful methods of a thorough criticism. The author's strong historical sense, too, kept him from those a priori constructions which are at the basis of so much of the recent destructive criticism upon early Christian history, including the writings of the New Testament.

This volume examines the Pauline Epistles, from Galatians on, includ-

ing the Apocryphal Pauline Epistles; the Epistle to the Hebrews—and the rest of the New Testament. It concludes, (pp. 253–415) with a very valuable and condensed history of the Canon and history of the Text. As to the Canon. Dr. Bleek concludes, that while some of the lesser New Testament works may be called “deutero-canonical in different degrees,” yet “there is no sufficient ground to warrant our excluding any of them from the New Testament collection;” “and that there is *still less* warrant for our receiving into the New Testament collection *any other* writings of Christian antiquity.” This is the result to which criticism is surely tending more and more.

Hurd & Houghton have brought out the concluding part of *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, amply furnished with Indices. The work is bound in 4 vols. at \$6.50 per vol. in cloth. Many laymen can confer a great benefit on their parish by giving it to their pastor. In this American revision it is on the whole the best book of its class—the most erudite and accurate. In a future number we hope to recur to it again more fully.

Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with an introduction on the Life, Times, and Character of Paul. By WM. S. PLUMMER, D. D., LL. D. New York: A. D. Randolph & Co. Large 8vo., pp. 646. The author's work on the Psalms noticed in this *Review* for Jan. 1867, will indicate the general character of the present commentary. It is scholarly without being specially critical. It embodies the results of former labors without aiming at originality. It is fearless and positive on matters of doctrine without being controversial. It is thoroughly evangelical in spirit, and full of instruction. The arrangement is simple, and somewhat unique. The style is concise, terse, and at times forcible. The work was planned and a good part of it executed before the appearance of several recent and important commentaries on this Epistle. Hence no notice of them appears in the volume, and no allusion to the new forms or phases of discussion introduced by these authors. This we deem a mistake, in a critical point of view. However confident the author may be in the results of his own labors, he can not afford to ignore the works of contemporary writers, some of whom are eminent scholars and critics, who have made important contributions to the literature of the subject.

CHURCH HISTORY.

Presbyterian Reunion: a Memorial Volume; 1837–1871. New York: DeWitt C. Lent & Co. So important an ecclesiastical movement, as that of the reunion of the Old and New School Presbyterian churches of our country, was probably never brought about with less of friction and controversy; none ever left behind so few relics of the strife. Both parties were vanquished and both were victorious. In our last Assembly, and in the various meetings of the reunited and redistributed Synods and Presbyteries, there is no more, there is said to be rather less, of difference and debate than there was in many of the divided bodies out of which the new building was framed. There has not anywhere been enough vitality in the opposition to form even an outlying presbytery. The union was a spiritual marriage.

The work was of God and not of man. Divine wisdom and power guided its inception, its progress, and its consummation. And we may well believe that the Great Head of the Church will not leave his work unfinished; that he will pour out, by his Spirit upon our united churches, the abundant blessings of his wisdom and grace to fulfill their high calling. For we have come together, not to forward any personal aims or party ends, but to do Christ's work in our day and land, with ampler means and wider scope. We have not come together to rest, but to work; we have come to peace among ourselves that we may better carry on the war against all that opposeth itself to the Gospel of Christ.

It was fitting that there should be a Memorial of this beneficent and inspiring history. The time has not yet come for writing it out in all its aspects and relations; this can only be done when the materials are fully collected, and when the results have been developed. But an account of the events and acts, and of the actors in them, was needed, and the need has been well supplied in this Memorial Volume. Dr. Samuel Miller gives a review of the history of the Old School since 1837, and Dr. Jonathan F. Stearns performs the same service for the New. The Biographical Sketches of the Old School are written by the learned pen of Dr. Sprague, those of the New School by Dr. Humphrey of Philadelphia. The Reunion is felicitously described by Dr. Wm. Adams of New York. The Moderators of the Assemblies of 1869, Dr. Jacobus and Dr. Fowler, give an account of their sessions; the Rev. G. S. Plumley writes on the Reconstruction, and Dr. John Hall depicts the work and honor of the Future Church. An Appendix contains the Statistics, Sketches of the Members of the Reunion Committees, Documents, etc.

With such a variety of writers there will of course be differences of judgment as to certain points and measures; but, on the whole, one and the same spirit pervades the volume. Each writer in fact seems anxious to do justice to (what was) the other side. Some of the writers were also chief actors in the work, and have hardly done justice to their own share in bringing about the result: this is the case with the otherwise impartial and excellent papers of Dr. Adams and Dr. Stearns. But the future historian of the church will rectify their shortcomings in this particular.

The publisher has done his part well. The book is amply illustrated, and furnished at a moderate price. It deserves a wide circulation.

The same House have published the first American from the fifth London edition of *The Reign of Law*, by the DUKE OF ARGYLE—one of the ablest works of its class which has of late appeared. We have already commended it to the favorable notice of our readers.

Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century. By FELIX BUNGENER. Translated from the French. With Additions by the Author. Edinburgh. 1870. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. M. Bungener, by his works on the Council of Trent, and on many phases of Romanism, was amply prepared for making this volume, which, written for the most part before the meeting of the Vatican Council, foreshadowed in a confident manner, justified by the event, what that Council must be and do. He saw the logic of the case, and that Rome must fulfill its destiny—and proclaim the Papal Infallibility as the topstone of its system. The author is a pungent critic, an acute polemic, and a thorough-going Protestant. His work is

both entertaining and instructive. His sharp sayings cut deep. There is a perpetual animation in his style. His love of point and epigram sometimes betrays him into exaggerations; but there is a solid vein of good sense and sound doctrine pervading his polemics. The Table of Contents by itself is anything but tedious. He discusses the Syllabus, and the Bishops and the Syllabus, the Sophists and the Sophistries, the System and its Difficulties, the inevitable Consequences of the System, the Papacy politically and morally and as a Centre of Light, its divine right and its history, its retrograde Progress, Mariolatry, Images, Miracles and Relics. The work is so concise and pregnant as to be well worth the reading.

A History of God's Church from its Origin to the Present Time. By ENOCH POND, D. D. Hartford, Conn.: S. S. Scranton & Co. pp. 1066. With an excellent likeness of the Author, and pictorial illustrations. Dr. Pond abundantly fulfils the promise made by the Psalmist to God's people, that "they shall still bring forth fruit in old age." His has been a laborious, useful and honored life. By faithful and self-denying work, amid many trials, he has for half a century helped in training an earnest ministry, not only for the churches in Maine, which owe so much to him, but also for many other States and far distant lands. Hundreds of pupils he has helped to think for themselves and to think clearly; and he has prepared them to be faithful ambassadors of Christ's Gospel. And they will ever look to him with affection and reverence. Such a life is an ennobling example, better than any book.

But by his books he has also maintained and forwarded the good cause. In most of the controversies of the times he has had a part; his name is found as a contributor to almost all our leading theological periodicals. He always writes clearly and to the point. In the last few years he has published instructive works on Practical and Systematic Theology; and in the present volume he gathers up the results of his various studies in the History of the Church. It is prepared, as he says in his Preface, distinctively as a "religious book, imbued with the spirit, and in sympathy with the great truths and facts, of the Gospel." The "recent German histories" were "all so contaminated with the transcendental Philosophy, and so destitute of the spirit and principles of evangelical religion, as to render them unsuitable for my purpose." This condemnation of the German histories will be thought by many to be too sweeping; Neander's work is certainly deeply religious: but it indicates the need of a more practical handling of the subject, adapted to our American modes of thought, and to the religious experience of our people. This want Dr. Pond has endeavored to supply.

His History is divided into two parts; I. The History of Christ's Church until the Coming of Christ. From the coming of Christ to the Present Time. The last is subdivided into eight Periods, covering the ground, in its latest periods, in rapid sketches, down to the "benevolent movements in the present century."

While the work is not exactly fitted to the wants of students, grappling with the intricate questions of historical and doctrinal criticism; it is yet well adapted to meet the need, suggested in the recommendation of the Professors in the Bangor Theological Seminary, who say: "The author has here presented the leading facts connected with his subject with all that clearness and simplicity of style for which he is distinguished, and has given us emphatically an Ecclesiastical History for the people. We anticipate for it an extensive circulation."

The Life and Times of John Huss; or, The Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century. By E. H. GILLET. Prof. of Political Science in the University of the City of New York 2 Vols. 12mo. Third Edition, carefully revised, with important additions and an Appendix. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. This edition of "The Life and Times of John Huss" is enriched by

an Appendix which embodies the most important results of the historical investigations of F. Palacky, the Historiographer of Bohemia. These investigations have been prosecuted with untiring enthusiasm for more than forty years. In an 8vo volume, of over 700 pages—noticed in our number of July, 1869—Palacky has brought together all the materials illustrative of the career of Huss, which he has been able to glean from public and private sources during a long period of diligent exploration. From this mine Prof. Gilett has selected what he regarded as most important, not already included in his work, and by notes of reference to the text has brought it into connection with his own narrative. Some changes and corrections have been made in the stereotype plates, but the new matter of this edition is mainly in the Appendix, consisting of more than 30 closely printed 8vo pages. One of the notes discusses, at considerable length, the much controverted subject of Huss' safe conduct.

History of the Sandwich Islands Mission. By RUFUS ANDERSON, D.D., LL.D. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. 12 mo. pp. xxiv. 498. When the venerable author retired from official life some years since, after a connection of more than forty years with the Board, it was with the hope of turning to good account his wise experience and knowledge in the Missionary cause. The first fruit of this purpose was his volume entitled "Foreign Missions, their Relations and Claims." The present is the first of a series, undertaken at the request of the Prudential Committee, giving "a History of the Board to the present time."

The author has naturally yielded to the prior claims of the Sandwich Islands Mission, and given us its history first. Regarded likewise as an experiment in Missions, its history is specially instructive to the Missionary work. The results are certainly remarkable. A heathen nation has been evangelized in our day, and a Christian government organized, "with a native sovereign at its head a government as confessedly cognizant of God's law and the Gospel, as any one of the governments of Christian Europe; and what is more, with a Christian community of self-governed, self-supporting churches, embracing as large a proportion of the people, and as really entitled to the Christian name, as the churches of the most favored Christian countries." It is a question of the highest interest by what means this great amount of moral, social and civil life was there developed. This book answers that question; and it does it by a simple and succinct statement of facts, as they became known to the author, from his correspondence and intercourse with the Mission during almost the entire period of its existence. Facts such as we have set forth in all fairness and without a shade of exaggeration, must prove stimulating and useful to the generation now coming upon the great field of Christian action.

PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY.

The Science of Thought; a System of Logic. By CHARLES CARROLL EVERETT. Boston: Nichols & Hall. The exact and narrow domain which the Formal Logic of the schools thought to be its exclusive possession, is now vigorously invaded from two opposite sides—the inductive and the idealistic. Each of these is striving to deprive it of its independent sovereignty, and subordinate it to higher ideas and laws. And Psychology, too, comes in with its claims to be the only fitting interpreter of the facts of consciousness.

In England the school of Mill has been striving to identify Logic and the Inductive processes. The Inductive method has been found so useful and successful in its application to the sphere of external phenomena, that its advocates, intoxicated by their victories here, are going on to claim, not only the whole of the soul, but also all of the universe, as subject to the same method; or else they say, there is nothing worth knowing there. The

German Idealists, starting for the other pole of being, are also striving, with at least equal right and by a more imperial method, to bring all the power of the Syllogism under the sway of their all-embracing system. Hegel and his followers, and others inspired by them, represent this tendency. Thus an old, simple logic seems in danger of being crushed out between the upper and the nether millstone; perhaps it may then be ground out into a more nutritious shape.

And of one thing our materializing philosophers may be sure—unless the laws of mind and history change of a sudden—that the sharper they advocate their exclusive claims, the more certainly will they find this ineradicable idealism confronting them; they always find it, and sometimes bow to it, on the outer verge of the kingdom of sight and sound. Materialism ends by provoking and evoking the hidden forces of the spiritual world.

Prof. Everett, of the Divinity School in Cambridge, has made a somewhat bold venture in this able and thoughtful volume—reproducing in his own way the main principles and methods of the *Encyclopædia* of Hegel—not neglecting other German writers, especially Schopenhauer. The work is worthy of study. A better conception of the claims and processes of Idealism can be got from it than from any of the ordinary histories of philosophy. Some of its exclusive pretensions are here modified. The Formal Logic is made a part of the more general system, here called "The Science of Thought." The term "Logic" in the nomenclature of this school embraces Reason and its contents, as well as the processes by which we arrive at or develop truth. We have no space now to go into a more particular examination of its contents. Dissenting from many positions and from the general method (as final), we can still commend it as a carefully worked out treatise. Considering the remote and tenuous nature of the subjects, the style is unusually clear; nor is much violence done to the English speech. It grapples, as the idealistic side, with a great problem, on which many books must yet be written.

Outline of Sir Wm. Hamilton's Philosophy. A Text Book for Students. By REV. T. C. MURRAY: With an Introduction by PRESIDENT M'COSH, LL.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Dr. M'Cosh's cordial testimony is sufficient evidence of the faithfulness with which Prof. Murray (of Queen's University, Canada) has performed his somewhat difficult task. Hamilton is here more condensed and systematic, and perhaps more consistent, than in his own works. An "Introduction" presents his views on the Nature of Philosophy, with his Classification of the Philosophical Science. Three Divisions follow: 1. Phenomenal Psychology—the bulk of the volume, pp. 31 to 231; 2. Nomological Psychology, despatched in five pages; 3. Inferential Psychology, in twenty pages. As a clear and concise guide to the Hamiltonian system it will be found of much use.

Mental Philosophy: Embracing the three Departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities and Will. By THOMAS C. UPHAM, D. D. 2 Vols. I. The Intellect with an Appendix on Language. II. The Sensibilities and Will. Harper & Brothers. More than forty years have passed away since Dr. Upham's Philosophy was first published; it has since gone through several editions, and the revered authors still lives to bring out a new and revised edition. This demand of a new edition is alone a sufficient testimony to its merits as a text-book. In this new form it will doubtless have many students as of old. The arrangement of topics is natural; the style is simple and intelligible—no slight advantage in a work on this subject. The author is so anxious to do justice to others that his original observations and classifications on many incidental points are in danger of being overlooked. His materials are derived from a wide range of careful reading, laying under contribution not only the great works on the subject, but also many collateral sources. His system is essentially eclectic—not in the sense of indifference, but of a selection of what is best in the various

schools. He belongs to the advocates of a truly Spiritual Philosophy, without using any transcendental jargon. And above all, his work is written not only in entire harmony with the principles of religion, but also as an indirect contribution to their defense. So far as such a treatise can be, or ought to be, religious, this is so. No one need be afraid to put it into the hands of pupils on this score. It will be found a safeguard against skepticism. It is thus well adapted to introduce classes to the great questions which philosophy raises, and religion solves.

The History of Rome. By THEODORE MOMMSEN. Vol. IV. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This volume completes MommSEN's History of Rome. It closes with "the Old Republic and the New Monarchy." Of the thorough and scholarly character of the work we have spoken in our notice of the preceding volumes. The philosophical merits of the history are seen in the disquisitions on government, literature, art, and kindred topics, which are very ably handled. The lucid and elegant style of the narrative is an additional feature of attraction, rarely found in translations, and especially those made from German writers. MommSEN is not content to follow in the beaten track of preceding writers. He differs repeatedly from his predecessors on some important points. Those for instance who are familiar with the lives of Cicero, by Middleton and Forsyth, will find his character here portrayed in decidedly less flattering colors.

PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

Bible Notes for Daily Readings. A Comment on Holy Scripture. By EZRA M. HUNT, A. M., M. D. 2 Vols. Large 8vo. pp. 576, 794. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This voluminous work is from the pen of a layman. "It was commenced many years ago as a necessity for religious experience," says the author, "and were it not for providences and convictions and counsels, which I could not resist, and which seemed to call me to this service, I should never have completed the work." Evidently it has been a labor of love, a pains-taking and conscientious effort to promote the study of the Scriptures. And, in some respects, the work is creditable, and may be used with benefit. Persons of ordinary education, and the mass of Sunday-school teachers, may consult it with advantage. It lays no claim to scholarship, and possesses no value as a critical commentary. The scholar will not prize it, and we fear it is quite too bulky to find favor with the class for whom it is better fitted.

Morning and Evening Exercises: Selected from the published and unpublished writings of the Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER. Edited by LYMAN ABBOTT. Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 560. The editor is responsible only for the selection and arrangement of the matter embraced in this volume. The thoughts and the words are all Mr. Beecher's, and the work is published with his approval. The book is meant to be one "simply of devotional readings." "Heartily accepting that Catholic conception of religion of which Mr. Beecher is the most distinguished modern exponent," a much wider range of topics is allowed than is usually embraced by our devotional literature. To the admirers of the author this feature will be an attraction rather than otherwise; but to a large class the work will sometimes appear not adapted to such a purpose. But however varied and excellent and often striking and beautiful are the thoughts here presented, we must protest against the idea of the editor. Scripture words and Scripture thoughts are better for "devotional" purposes than the grandest words and thoughts that human genius ever inspired. Mr. Abbott has attempted to meet this obvious objection by introducing each exercise with a text of Scripture. But he has not helped the matter by so doing. In the majority of cases there is no connection between the text and the thoughts which follow, and in many there is an utter incongruity. While we commend the book as characteristic of the Author, and far more satisfactory than any former attempt

to give his select thoughts to the public, we still think that "Jay's Morning and Evening Exercises" are superior for purely "devotional" purposes.

Robert Carter & Brothers, bring out, as usual, a goodly assortment of solid and select works. A new edition of *Dr. Hanna's Life of Christ*, six volumes bound in three, is offered at a reduced price; and it ought to command a large sale. Not pretending to be a work of criticism it yet shows the results of conscientious study, as well as of faithful personal examination of many of the most noted scenes. It is an eloquent exposition and amplification of the sacred record, leaving upon the mind a vivid impression of the reality of the narrative. Its results on mooted points of topography, are in the main judicious. They also publish the fifth edition of *Dr. Bonar's Life of the Rev. John Milne*, of Perth, brought out in a handsome style. We renew our commendation of this attractive memorial of a man who lived above the world, incessant in labor for the good of man, and the cause of his Master. Young ministers may well ponder such a life. *Dr. Bonar's Light and Truth: or Bible Thoughts and Themes, on the Lesser Epistles*, is produced in the same style, and covers, in suggestive practical comments, some of the main points in Paul's epistles, from Galatians on, and in the epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude. The phrase "Lesser Epistles" does not appropriately suggest all of these. It is a voluminous in practical experience, and concise and forcible in its advocacy of the truth. *Rev. W. F. Sterner's Life and Deeds Worth Knowing About*, gives interesting sketches of Harms of Hermannsburg, Hans Egede's Mission, Spittler, Barth, Madame Zell, George Neumark, Huss, Claudius, Dr. Chalmers at Elberfeld, etc. The chapter on the "Biography of Certain Hymns" suggests, and partly carries out, a most interesting theme.—And here comes last the long-time favorite of so many Christian households, the author of "The Wide, Wide World," in an attractive tale entitled "*What She Could*," written with her wonted insight and deep and tender religious feeling. It is to be continued.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Books and Reading; or What Books shall I read, and How shall I read them? By NOAH PORTER, D. D., LL. D. Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo. pp. 378. The title of this book indicates its character. The author gives an intelligent and satisfactory answer to the important question—an answer that evinces a familiar and critical acquaintance with most of the English literature of the world, and the possession of mental tastes and moral qualities that eminently qualify him for this task. Such a book is greatly needed, and is adapted to be highly useful. It will be worth many times its cost to any person who proposes to himself a course of reading.

Words and their Uses. Past and Present. A Story of the English Language. By RICHARD GRANT WHITE. Sheldon & Co. 12mo. pp. 437. The substance of this volume has already been given to the public in the *Galaxy*. Critics differ widely as to its merits. The press quite generally has commended it both in its serial and book form, while eminent critics affirm that "It abounds with statements so reckless, with blunders so gross, and with ideas so confused, that it will be a dangerous guide to any one who is disposed to regard it as an authority." It seems likely to occasion a discussion as warm (and most likely as unsatisfactory) as Dean Alford's "Queen's English," and Washington Moon's "Dean's English." Read with care and discrimination—comparing and judging for one's self and not accepting Mr. White as an authority—the book may be made to do good service. Certainly it suggests a highly interesting subject for study and investigation.

Three volumes have been added to the very valuable "Illustrated Library of Wonders" (Charles Scribner & Co.) since the issue of the last number of the REVIEW. One of these volumes is devoted to *Balloons*, giving a history

of aeronautic exploits; another to *Strength and Skill*, and the third to an account of the *Wonders* which recent investigations have revealed in the ocean depths. Very numerous illustrations make the graphic explanations of the text still more lucid. The commendation which we have given to each successive issue of this unique Library is fully deserved by these latest volumes; and we will only say in addition that it is a mistake to infer, as some seem to have done, that the works comprised in this series are only adapted for younger readers. With two or three exceptions the volumes would form a most valuable addition to any Library. Each one is a complete treatise upon some special branch of study in science or the arts, and we know of no other storehouse so compactly filled with material for apt and forcible illustrations. The familiar style in which the different phenomena are described, or the various facts are presented, add greatly to the practical value of the different volumes. To parents who may be seeking for presents which their children would value more as they grow older this Library may be most warmly commended. The twenty volumes now issued are devoted to as many distinct subjects, and they contain over one thousand illustrations.

Messrs. Fields, Osgood & Co. have brought out a new edition (the eighth), of that standard work, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D.* By DEAN STANLEY. The two volumes are here compressed into one, making nearly 800 pages.

My Summer in a Garden. By CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER. Fields, Osgood & Co. 12 mo. pp. 191. Mr. Beecher, in a characteristic Introductory Letter, pays this book a very high compliment. It deserves it. The substance of it appeared in the form of garden letters in the *Hartford Courant* during the past summer from the pen of its editor. The book is fresh, quaint, delightful and instructive. The author is a close observer as well as an ardent admirer of Nature. But he treats us to the philosophic rather than the scientific side of it. We have no lessons or theories in horticulture, but we have shrewd observation, quaint humor, and subtle and often striking analogy, and suggestive criticism on men and things; and the way in which it is expressed is so easy and natural, and unstudied and good-natured, as to afford downright pleasure to the reader.

June Stories. By JACOB ABBOTT. Messrs. Dodd & Mead, New York, have added two more volumes to this valuable series—*June on a Journey*, and *Hubert*—in the same unique binding and beautiful style as the first. They also send us a new work from the gifted pen of Mrs. Charles, the author of the famous "Schonberg-Cotta Family," a writer ever welcome to the American public. *The Victory of the Vanquished*, a story of the first century, is the title of this new volume.

Geology and Physical Geography of Brazil. By Ch. FRED. HARTT. With Illustrations and Maps. Fields, Osgood & Co. 8vo. pp. 620. The author, a Professor in Cornell University, was an *attaché* of the Thayer Expedition which explored Brazil in the years 1865 and 1866. Not completing his investigations the author made a second private expedition, and the present volume is the result of his two visits to Brazil. It was intended at first as a report to Prof. Agassiz, the director of the expedition, embracing simply the fruits of his two expeditions as they bore on geology. During the preparation, however, of these reports, and the delay in publication, Prof. Hartt has had the opportunity of carefully examining the various writers on Brazil, and instead of a book embracing the simple report of his own investigations, we have a general work, incorporating the best results of other writers on the geology and physical geography of that empire.

We scarcely need to add that, not only in a scientific but a general sense, the work is one of decided interest and value, and reflects credit on the author and on the country.

ART. X.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE. GERMANY.

The chief theological, as well as the literary and scientific periodicals of Germany are published regularly, in the midst of the war; nor do they show any abatement of ability or interest. All of them, too, keep to their proper work. From anything contained in these journals, it could not be inferred that the whole of Germany was now arrayed in the most united and gigantic conflict it ever waged. With more than Olympian serenity they still discourse upon the intricate problems of knowing and being, or upon the vexed questions of polemic and historical theology.

The *Studien und Kritiken*, No. 1, 1871, opens with an interesting sketch by Dr. J. Köstlin, on "Luther's Life before the Controversy about Indulgences," tracing the steps through which he came to his bold stand. Prof. Meuss of Breslau examines the "Principles of Modern Thought in Application to Christianity." Pastor Engelhardt analyzes the logical connections of the difficult passage, Ephesians iv, 7-16, and Superintendent Pfeiffer investigates the etymological relations of "Sarai and Sarah." There are also reviews of Nöldeke on the "Criticism of the Old Testament," by Rösch; of Wieseler's new work on the Gospels, by Düsterdieck; and of the late Prof. Baxmann's "Political Growth of the Papacy," by Dr. Hermann Reuter, of Breslau. The latter does not find in Baxmann any real advance on the laborious researches of Giesebrecht in his "Church History," covering parts of the same periods.

Hilgenfeld's Journal of Scientific Theology (Zeltschrift f. d. wiss. Theologie), No. 4, 1870, contains three articles by the editor—a sharp review of Prof. Volkmar's recent work on the Gospels, a dissertation on the two Epistles of Clement of Rome, and a criticism of some recent speculations as to the time when the prophecy of Joel was written. Prof. Grimm, of Jena, examines the newest discussions about the time when the Epistle of James was composed; Dr. Egli, of Zurich, continues his criticisms upon the text of Exodus; and Calnich investigates the question about the original text of the Augsburg Confession, etc., as it was received by the Naumburg Diet in 1561. According to the latter, Melancthon was supposed to have taught Transubstantiation as late as 1561; hence the alteration in the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession must be of later date; and, consequently, the zeal for the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession is a vain thing.

The two articles in this periodical on Joel and James give striking evidence of the discord, among even the most confident of the progressive critics, as to the time when the books of the Scripture were written. Baur says that James can not have been written before A. D. 100 to 120; Schweizer puts it about A. D. 150; while Eichhorn and Hofmann contend for A. D. 44 to 52. Hilgenfeld and Vatke assign the book of Joel to about 450 B. C. Hitzig and Credner say it must have been composed at last 850 years before Christ.

The same Journal for January, 1871, begins with an article by Professor Biedermann, of Zurich, on the "Fundamental Rational Conceptions of Religion," including a criticism of Pfleiderer's recent work on the "Essence and History of Religion." Biedermann is a thorough-going pantheist, denying in his "Dogmatics" the personality of God, and the immortality of the soul. This Essay, like his other writings, resolves all our ideas of God into merely abstract notions.

Zeitschrift f. d. lutherische Theologie, III and IV, 1870. Koehler, The Address of Peter in Acts ii, 14-36. H. Müller, The "Descent to Hell" no myth, against Schweizer, and on the basis of 1 Pet. iii, 17-22. Ed. Graf, a Contribution to the Comparative Criticism of the Gospels, on the daughter of Jairus. C. T. Ficker, The Oath an Exegetical and Ethical Study. C. F. Keil on Millenarianism (Chiliasm). The usual full Critical Bibliography of late theological works is continued in each number.

Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie. No. 1, 1871, edited by Dr. Kahnls, of Leipsick, published in Gotha by Perthes. 1. C. F. Koehler, an Address on Gottfried Arnold, the author of the "History of the Church and of Heresies." 2. Prof. Friedberg, of Leipsick, on the History of the Interim and Agenda, as held in the lands of the Elector of Saxony, 1549, giving an account of new documents on the subject. 3. Th. Foerster, on the Biography of Dionysius of Alexandria. 4. Dr. Koch, on the Life and Writings of Asterius, Bishop of Amasea, with a Homily of his. 5. Karl Leimbach, Tertullian as an authority on Christian Archaeology.

Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie. Nos. 2 and 3, 1870. Wagenmann, a Centennial Memoir of Tersteegen, Hiller, and Gellert. Romang, the Neo-Speculative Christianity—an able criticism on the pantheistic "Dogmatics" of Prof. Biedermann of Zurich. Zoëckler, the Traditions about the Flood in Ancient Times, in relation to the Biblical Narrative—an elaborate apologetic paper. In the third part: Wagenmann, Sketches in past Church History, with bearings upon the present. Schmidt, the Eschatology of the Scriptures in its importance for the whole of Dogmatics, and for the Christian Life. Herrlinger, Studies on the Theology of Melancthon. Each number concludes with thoroughly prepared criticisms, by competent hands, upon the latest theological treatises.

Heidenheim's *Quarterly for German and English Theological Investigations*. Vol. IV., Part 2, contains a translation by Dr. Zingerle of the apocryphal "Apocalypse of St. Paul," from a Syrian manuscript in the Vatican Library. It was probably written about the end of the fourth century, and is a curious document. Dr. Leitner translates the "Samaritan Legends about Moses," from an Arabic manuscript of the British Museum; and the editor comments on these and on the fable of the "Assumption of Moses," as reported in Rabbinic traditions.

Zeitschrift f. Philosophie, edited by Ulrich, Fichte and Wirth. Vols. 56 and 57, 1870. Ulrich on the Logical Question, with a discussion of the works of Trendelenburg, George, Ueberweg and Kuno Fischer—this paper is on Concepts, Judgments and Inference—an able article, well worthy of the study of logicians. Professor Fichte, of Bonn, investigates the ideas of Soul, Spirit and Consciousness from the standpoint of Psychophysics; and also concludes a critical essay on the metaphysical and logical basis of "Concrete Theism," in opposition to the pantheistic and kindred speculations. Dr. R. Hippenmeyer examines the historical development and significance of Kant's Criticism of Rational Psychology. Freiherr von Reichlin-Meldegg, an independent and witty Professor of Philosophy, at Heidelberg, contributes a letter to Mr. Collins Simon on the question of "Immaterialism," as connected with the system of Berkeley, of which Simon is an advocate. Dr. Ueberweg, of Königsberg, discusses the same question in the 55th volume of this periodical. Dr. Ueberweg has an article on the "Order of Plato's Writings," with reference to recent investigations. Among the notices of philosophical works, a friendly greeting is given to the St. Louis "Journal of Speculative Philosophy," edited by W. T. Harris.

FRANCE.

Revue Chrétienne. Paris: July, August, and September, 1870. This able organ of French Protestant Theology, continued to be published until after the capture of Sedan. It ascribes the fatal results of the war to the pride and sins of the Empire; but it is severe against the Prussians and exhorts to fight out to the bitter end. In the July number, the chief editor, E. de Pressensé, has an excellent article on the Infallibility of the Pope and on the Vatican Council; and he contributes to the September number an extended review of the results of the latest researches in the Roman Catacombs and the Palace of the Cesars, showing clearly that they run

counter to the pretention of the Papacy. A. Cazalet has a good study on Vauvenargues; Albrasy criticises the Exposition of 1870; B. Couve examines the moral philosophy of the academician Caro, one of the most enlightened French advocates of a spiritual and theistic Philosophy; L. Rey on the Penalty of Death; L. Buffet on Lambert d'Avignon. Ch. Secretan's "Logic of Catholicism" is an extract from a new edition of his valuable "History of the Philosophy of Liberty." The "Bibliographical Bulletins" do not indicate much activity in the making of new theological works. Pastor Bersier's "Solidarity in respect to Sin and Redemption" is the most important of these publications, and is said to be his best work; a fourth volume of his Sermons is also announced. A translation of Dorner's "History of Protestant Theology"; M^{me}. Monod, "Woman's Mission in Time of War"; "The War and Charity" by G. Moynier and Dr. Appia—are among the new volumes.

The *Revue Théologique*, published quarterly, took the place last year (1870), with a wider scope, of the "Bulletin," which was first issued as a supplement to the "Christian Review." Three numbers of the new journal have appeared and give good promise for the future—after the war. It is edited by Pastor Babut of Nîmes. Profs. Bois and Bonifas of Montauban, Profs. Lichtenberger and Sabatier of Strasburg, Pressensé and Hollard of Paris, etc. Its price is 9 francs a year in this country. The articles thus far are—Byse on Authority in Matters of Faith; A. Wahnitz, The Sojourn of the Apostle John at Ephesus, two articles; G. Meyer, The Son of Man and the Son of God; Th. Rivier, Note on Romans v, 12; Bois, Miracles and the Critics; Lichtenberger, The Essence of Religion; Babut, The Theological System of Rothe; Le Savoureux on the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament; R. Hollard on Prof. S. Chapuis; Leclercq, the Exegetical Writings of Luther; Luthardt on the Person of Christ. In the review of Books Prof. Bois' conferences, entitled "The Gospel and Liberty," are highly commended; they are chiefly apologetic; the topics are—Free examination, God, Man, Redemption, the Holy Spirit, the Church.

The *Revue des Deux Mondes* of Sept. 15 contains an article by Ernest Renan on "the War between France and Germany." It is intended in part as an offset or reply to Strauss' articles on the same subject in the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung*; but the Teuton is stronger than the Celt; though Renan is more just to some elements of the German cause than are most Frenchmen. He sees the necessity of German unity; he extols the large and persistent plans of Bismarck; and he virtually puts France in the wrong as to the beginning of the present struggle; and he speaks of the late emperor with undisguised aversion. Yet he contends that in the peace, which must come, France ought not to be humiliated, that is, it ought not to give up any of its territory, and hence he exhorts to the continuance of the present desperate struggle. And he believes that a united Germany will absorb Prussia and not be Prussianized. The article abounds in those graces of style of which Renan is an acknowledged master.

REV. ALBERT BARNES.

The notice of the death sudden and unexpected, of this beloved brother and eminent divine and author, one of the Associate Editors of this REVIEW, is received at too late an hour for us to do more than announce it in our present issue. In the APRIL number we shall aim to give such a testimony to his rare character and distinguished services as he merits at our hands, particularly in his relation to this REVIEW and to the DENOMINATION of which he was so bright an ornament. We can, for the present, but mingle our regrets and tears with his sorrowing family, and with our ministerial brethren and the church of Christ everywhere, by whom his death will be mourned, as that of a friend, and as a public calamity. A truly good man has fallen—great in his goodness as well as in other qualities—full of years, after a life crowded with holy activities, and crowned with more than an ordinary measure of grace and usefulness.

